THEOLOGY MORAL OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST VENERABLE D. ALPHONSE DE LIGORIO, ONCE BISHOP OF S. AGATHLE OF GOTHORUM, AND RECTOR OF THE MAJOR CONGREGATION SS. THE REDEEMER, BY PIUS VII, ON THE 15TH OF SEPTEMBER IN THE YEAR 1816 BECOMED IN BLESSEDNESS RANKED, WITH A USEFUL INSTRUCTION ADDED AT THE FOOT FOR CONFESSORS, TOGETHER WITH AN EPITOME OF THE DOCTRINE OF MORAL AND CANONICAL BY THE ILLUSTrious AND REVEREND John Dominic Mansion, ARCHBISHOP OF LUCENZ FROM THE WORKS OF BENEDICT XIV. ## CORRECTED EDITION. ## FIFTH VOLUME. Commencing Trastatus on the Eucharist, Mass as a Sacrifice, and Penitence. ANTVERPIE, IN THE PRELO OF JANSSENS AND VAN MERLEN, IN THE CORIARIUM SQUARE. 1822. C 1276.3.3. HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY FROM THE LIBRARY OF JOHN CHIPMAN GRAY GIFT OF ROLAND GRAY SEPTEMBER 4, 1934,,,

the res tantùm is that which is signified, or the effect of the sacrament; the sacramentum ac res simul is that which is signified by one and signifies another. In hoc autem Sacramento Eucharistiae sunt Sacramentum tantùm species consecrata, quæ tantùm significant animæ reflectiones: Res tantùm est ipsa refectio; res et sacramentum est corpus Christi, quod significatur speciebus, et gratiam significat.

Here arises a great question among the Doctors, namely, what constitutes the essence of the Eucharist? There are many opinions, but two are more widely accepted. The first opinion, which Gonet holds c. 1 ex n. 18. cum 6oto, Gonz. Henry... says that the essence or reason of the Sacrament consists solely in the rectitude of species: but the body of Christ belongs to the Sacrament only obliquely, that is, as something extrinsically connoted. They prove it from chapter Cum Marthae, de Celebr.

Mises. ubi sic dicitur: Forma (idest species) est panis et vini; veritas, Carnis et Sanguinis; virtus unitatis et charitatis. First (that is to say, species) is the Sacrament, and not the thing. According to (that is, the body of Christ), it is the sacrament, and the thing itself. Third (that is, effect) is the thing itself, and not the Sacrament. Since therefore the text says that the species are the sacrament and distinguishes the sacrament from the thing simultaneously and the sacrament which is said to be the body of Christ; Therefore (as they say) the whole reason of the sacrament the text reduces to mere species.

They approve two from one where it is found: If anyone shall deny, in the SS. To contain truly, really, and substantially the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Dub. I. On the essence of the Eucharist. 8 Exhale the body, and the blood.... Dom.

N. Jesu Christi.... anathema sit. Therefore, if the body of Christ is contained in the Sacrament, it follows that the species are the Sacraments containing the body of Christ, lest it be said that the body of Christ contains itself. The second opinion, which Bus. 99.42. sect. 3.5, p. 134, and also Vasq. Concilium 1., cap. n. 29., declares, is that the Eucharistic Sacrament consists equally in the true species and in the Body of Christ. Reason, because from the body of Christ and equally from the species one becomes the sacrament. Christus autem continetur in Sacramento tamquam pars in toto, ut anima in homine, non vero tamquam aliquid extrinsecum à ratione Sacramenti.

And thus is the text opposed by the Tridentine responded to. This reason is confirmed by what St. Augustine relates in cap. Hoc est., 48 D. 2 de Consecr., where he teaches that this Sacrament consists of two things,

namely visible species of elements and invisible species of Divine elements. The nature of Christ's flesh and blood constitutes conformity to the Person of Christ from God and man. To the text in c. Martha: Lugo responds on the Eucharist. D. 1 n. 27. (who distinguishes a different sense in the sentiment, namely that: the essence of the Eucharist should consist directly in the body of Christ, and indirectly only in species) what the Pontiff means when he says that species are the Sacrament is not to imply that the species alone are the Sacrament, but rather that in the Eucharist they do not have any other munus than that of a Sacrament; for they signify and are not signified; this is for the difference of the body of Christ, which is both the Sacrament and the thing itself, namely that it signifies grace, and is signified by species; but the text does not exclude that the body of Christ belongs to the essence of the Sacrament.

Both opinions are probabitis.. 2. The use or consumption of the Eucharist is not properly the very Sacrament itself. Nor is it something distinct from the Sacrament as Gabriel would have it; nor a part thereof, whether essential or integral, as Aureolus would have it; but only an application, or condition, by which the Sacrament operates. Lib. VI. Treatise.

III. Concerning the Eucharist. All other Sacraments, as we noted at the beginning of this book 6, are called transitory, because they are only Sacraments when they are conferred and applied; this alone is said to be a permanent Sacrament of the Eucharist, because it consists in a permanent reality; thus, the Body of Christ existing after Consecration under the species of bread is truly and properly a Sacrament, whether taken or preserved in the tabernacle, as is defined in Canon 4: "Let him be anathema who says that after the completion of the Consecration, in the wonderful Eucharistic Sacrament there is not the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but only for use..." Even though any species, nay, any part of a species is integral and essentially perfect sacramentum, therefore physically and materially different in species from the Sacrament of Eucharistia under the species of bread and wine; yet morally and in respect to the species of the Sacrament it is one lowest species Sacrament: because it is one sign of sacred thing: because it is ordered to one lowest species end. See S. Thom. qu. 73 art. 1.

4. Even physically speaking, there are as many Sacraments as there are species, or supposed parts of species: yet morally speaking one number of Sacrament is; which is proposed and taken after the manner of one, because it refers to one end, namely to one spiritual nourishment. 5. Even physically speaking, there are as many Holy Sacraments as there are species or supposed parts of species: yet morally speaking one number of Holy Sacrament is; which is proposed and taken after the manner of one,

because it refers to one end, namely to one spiritual nourishment. Hostiae in diversis altaribus recte concipiuntur ut distincta Sacramenta; contra vero, si Sacerdos unam Hostiam dividat in plures partes vel plures Hostias simul sumat (est idem ratio plurium species diversae rationis), non ideò dicitur accipisse plura numero Sacramenta. Above all, it must be noted beforehand what is contained in the Tridentine section 13 chapter 3 Corpus (to exist) under the species of bread and blood of wine by virtue of the words; but the same Body under the species of wine and blood of bread, and the Soul under both species by reason of the mystery of that concomitant consecration, and the concomitants... As for the Divinity, on account of... the hypostatic union with its Body and Soul.

Item in sessione vicesima prima caput tertium habetur: Quamvis Redemptor noster hoc Sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit... tamen fatendum est praesumptum sub altera tantum specie totum, et integrum Christum, verumque Sacramentum sumi; ac propterea quod ad fructum attinet, nulli gratia necessaria ad salutem eos de fruendo reperiendi, qui unam speciem solum accipiant. But it is sought whether the whole specific nature of this Sacrament is preserved in the sole species of bread or wine, taken separately? First they allege, as Bellarmi says in lib. 1 dist. 4 de Nunnus, et alii apud Salm: cap. 2 n. 16. Reason, because each species has a reason for an integral convivium, when through concomitance Blood comes under the species of bread, and Body under the species of wine. They argue that from those very words of Trent, as mentioned above: To be received under one species alone the true Sacrament is to be taken.

The second more probable opinion states that the whole reason for the species of the sacrament is not preserved; except in both species. Thus Lugo on Euch. d. 2. sect. 1. Townsly in Praelet: 5 pag 134 et cum Ledesma, Cornejo, etc., ratio quia licet per concomitantiam Corpus Christi veniat sub specie vini, et contra: quod sufficit tamen ad totum assequendum fructum Sacramenti, ut docet Concilium; hoc tamen per accidens evenit; quia nunc Sanguis non potest a Corpore separari; sed non per se, nam si in tr. duo Passionis Apostoli celebrabissent, utique Sanguis non venisset sub specie panis. Whereby, when under one species alone by words it is placed either solely the Body or solely the Blood, it cannot per se signify through the other species the entire refectio of food and drink, in which consists the specific reason of this Sacrament. And for this opinion it seems that D. 2 ad 2 has expressed itself: when there it thus says: Bread and wine materially are many signs, formally however, and perfectly one, inasmuch as from them is perfected one refectio.

Therefore formally, or because it completes the specific reason of the

Sacrament, it is not perfected. Lib. VI. Treatise. Two.

On the Eucharist: nourishment is signified only insofar as both species are present. It is asked whether the numerical unity of this Sacrament is to be taken in both species? Others say that it is taken from the unity of the Body of Christ, as Lugo and c. 2 n. 46. with Soto, and Bellarmine hold, who maintain that although there are many consecrated species, even though they be discontinuous, and although physically there are many Sacraments, morally finally one is a Sacrament from the moral union which they have, since by the mode of one they are proposed or taken; and this opinion seems more probable according to Busemba as above 191. Wherefore concerning the species of this Sacrament it must be concluded that although each species is materially diverse, nevertheless morally both constitute one Sacrament, since both signify one constant meal composed of bread and wine. As regards the number, it must be avoided that the number be taken from the multiplicity of distributions; whence, if one species, or one Host is distributed to many, or to the same person at different morally distinct times, they are numerically diverse Sacraments.

On the contrary, if both species were ministered at the same time to someone, or if several parts of the same species were given; one would be the Sacrament. Thus likewise, if diverse species consecrated at the same time and on the same Altar are proposed, one will be the Sacrament; but if those very species are divided and proposed on different Altars, they will be diverse Sacraments. 192. It is asked 3. Is an Eucharist necessary for obtaining the first justification? It is supposed that the certainty with S. 11.

To have the Eucharist as necessary for salvation by the necessity of a Precept, not only ecclesiastical but also presumed divine, from Luke 22. Do this in remembrance of me. On the contrary, it is certain that it is not necessary with a necessity of precept, according to real reception, as the six commoncensures against Heretics assert. It is doubtful whether it is necessary even in a vow, by medial necessity? The first opinion denies it with St. Bonaventure. Cajetan, ibid., n. 14.

Reason, because this Sacrament is not instituted for causing the first Grace: And therefore. The Council of Lateran, however, holds the more probable opinion, as stated in Conci. p: 317 n. 6 Sot. Ludovicus et plures docent quod votum saltem virtuale et implicatum Eucharistiae, respiciens hoc Sacramentum ut finem vitae spiritualis, sit necessarium necessitate Medii ad salutem tam adultis quam parvulis: Adulteri autem tale votum habent dum Sacramenta Baptismi adulescentium aut Penitentiae suscipiunt; voluntas ipsorum omnia Praecepta implendi hoc etiam Praeceptum Eucharistiae saltem implicite comprehendit: Parvuli vero votum habent

non ex voluntate propria, sed ex voluntate implicita Ecclesiae quae puero applicatur congruenter applicatur voluntas suscipiendi Baptismum. And this he teaches in S. 79 ar. 1 ad 1, where he says: This Sacrament has of itself the power to confer Grace; no one has Grace before the reception of this Sacrament: unless from some vow of its own... congruent with adults, or a vow of the Church, so that it is congruent with adults, or a vow of the Church, so that it is also for children.... And it is first proved from John 6v. 54. nisi manducaveritis carmen filii hominis, etc., non habebitis vitam in vobis.

It is proven secondarily by reason, because the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance, which certainly are necessary with necessity of the Middle, at least in a voto, do not confer the first Grace obtainable. Grace, nisi respondiendo ad Eucharistiam, ut ad finem omnium Sacramentorum. It is inquired about 4. Is an Eucharist in reality or in desire a necessary medium for adults to preserve a spiritual life? They deny, however, that for this there are other necessary means among those who say so.

But more commonly and truly affirm this Solomon, Gonzalez, and with Saint Augustine ad libitum 11 ad 2. Reason, because a long life of the body cannot be preserved without material food, so too the life of the soul cannot be preserved without this spiritual food, at least in desire, and indeed explicitly in him who advertises the necessity of this Sacrament. Hence they hold with Cornéjo, etc., that it is not excused from sin, presumptuously receiving the Eucharist once in a year, if they know, Communion being so rare for them as not to suffice to persevere, considering their own infirmity. See no. 295 to be stated. Dub. 1. ## DUBIUM II. ## What is the Matter of the Eucharist? 194 What is the proximate Matter of this Sacrament? 195 Concerning the obligation of consecration under both species; See what is had among Busemb. 196 Dub. 1.

Whether this obligation be of Divine Law or of Ecclesiastical Law? Dub. 2. May the Pope dispense from that? Dub. 3. Whether a consecration of one species is valid without another? 197 Whether sometimes by chance one species can be consecrated without another? 194 "Note; in other Sacraments there is congruent a double matter, proximate and remote, thus this is presumed here, but with the order reversed: for in others, remote matter is a thing remaining; whereas proximate matter is used which passes away: here however it is the remote that passes away, and the proximate remains, namely the species of bread, and wine."

It is therefore queried solely concerning the remote matter, namely that which, through consecration, passes into the Body and Blood; this is of

Faith, and is proven from Christ's institution; indeed both matters, bread and wine, are so necessary for the conferring of this Sacrament, that neither can licitly be consecrated without the other: which is evident from Christ's very act. Luke then from that very fact. 1. The consecration of both species is of divine law, because the reason for the sacrifice, without which it would not be carried out, demands both. It is not permissible to consecrate only one species, presumptuously in necessity, gravely, viz., that viaticum may be given to the dying.

3. Consecration of both species is a matter of Divine law, because the reason for the sacrifice, without which it would not be accomplished, requires both. The Pontiff cannot dispense in that matter in any case. Thus commonly held. Session 55, Chapter 4, etc., against those certain individuals. » It is certain and necessary to consecrate the Eucharist according to the necessity of the precept 196: under both species, as D. 8o, art. 12 ad 3 with others commonly teaches, ex c. Conferimus. D. 2 de Consecr. et ex ut mox infra: Unde commuene ac certum est apud omnes, nec praesumptum in articulo mortis licitum esse consecrare unam speciem ad Viaticum infirmo porrigendum; Vide Bon. Decretum 4, quaestio 2, palmarium 3, nota 9, et alibi passim.

But there is doubt whether this precept is Divine or Episcopal? Navarr. Major, etc.: at Continens. But it must be held cautiously with Suarez in dist. 43 sess. 3. 425 n. 8., and Bonaventure in d. 4 q. 2 p. 3 n. 5 with Cajetan. Soto, Pahud.

King. Fill. and others commonly. This is weakened by chapter 22, section 1, where it is stated that Christ commanded the priests to offer His Body not otherwise than under both species; in the words of the Council: Christ offered His Body and Blood to God the Father under the species of bread and wine, and He gave them these same (noted) symbols to the Apostles... so that they might receive and hand them down, and their successors in the priesthood, according to this command: Do this in My commemoration; which the Catholic Church has always understood and taught. It is doubted whether the Pontiff can dispense from this precept? They affirm many grave doctors, namely in book 4, note 41, that this is probable; and in book 8, decision 6, note 6, and Cont.

Concl. 2 cum 2 cum ysamberto.. Et probant ex 21 c. 2 ubi dicitur: Hanc potestatem perpe- tud in Ecclesia fuisse, ut in Sacramentorum dispensatione salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret, quae suscipientium utilitati, seu ipsorum Sacramentorum ve- nerationi... magis expedire judicaret. But commonly they deny Saa. d. 43 s. 4. Lugo de Euchar. d. 10 s. 8 cum etc. Ratio, quia Ecclesia, etsi potest immutationes facere circa

administrationem Sacramentorum, ut loquitur Concilium, non autem potest circa ea, quae in Sacramentis administrandis sunt de praecepto Divino, prout est Consecratio tribusque speciei, ut mox supra probavimus. But this reason does not entirely convince, for as we shall say according to the opinion of many, it is probable that the Pope might presume in precepts. To dispense from Divine precepts on just grounds in some particular case, or at least then to interpret the Divine precept.

Nevertheless, this does not prevent me from saying that the first opinion cannot be deduced in practice, because (as we shall say shortly in the following doubt 3) it is probable that a Sacrament will not be conferred except in Sacrifice, to which (according to our aforementioned opinion n. 305). II. Necesse est quod consecratio utriusque speciei sit. Moreover, Tournai rightly says that the Church has never dispensed from this precept, nor will it ever be dispensable; commonly with etc., it rejects what refers to Rejicitur id, quod refert volaterranus l. l. 7. having dispensed with Norway, so that they might consecrate bread and chalice without wine, which is indeed incredible. It is doubted whether the consecration of one species without the other is valid? No one doubts that it would be valid if such a case were to occur, as will soon be said below concerning cases treated by Busemb.

Therefore a doubt arises: whether the priest validly consecrates one species without the other, when he has a positive intention to consecrate only one species? Lugo denies it in the Eucharist, d. 19, n. 103; what follows is from Renzi in the same work, tit. q. 45. Because (as he says), the reason for the Sacrament cannot be divided from the reason for the Sacrifice; for the priest does not receive the power to consecrate this Sacrament except by sacrificing, as is evident from the form of Ordination: Receive the power to offer the Sacrifice both for the living and for the dead. Wherefore, since the consummation of both species appears to pertain to the essence of the Sacrifice, according to the more probable opinion which we shall advance in note 305. Because (as it is said) the reason of the Sacrament cannot be divided from the reason of the Sacrifice; for the Priest does not receive the power of conferring this Sacrament except by sacrificing, as appears from the form of Ordination: Receive the power of offering Sacrifice both for the living and for the dead.

II. It follows that, he who does not offer the Sacrifice neither makes nor constitutes the Sacrament. Others commonly affirm, as in section 43, paragraph 2, page 109 note 130, rule 16. Bonaventura, dissertation 4, question ultimate, page 3, note 2, with concurrence. They indeed commonly affirm, as . 43 sect. 2. .3 p. 109 n. 130. 16 R. 7. Bon. d. 4 q. ult. p. 3 n. 2. with Con. Henry.

This opinion is indeed very probable; but the reasoning of Lughon does not seem improbable either; nor does it hinder the authority of D. Thom. in III Pars, q. 78, a. 6, which Bon. affirms for the second opinion, for there the Holy Doctor speaks only against those who would say that the Body is not consecrated unless after the Blood has been consecrated, which is certainly false. "I have spoken." By itself; because by accident, and apart from intention, it teaches that sometimes one alone can be consecrated without sin, Tan. d. 5 qu. 2 dub. 5 n. 27 says this to be common, for example, in these cases. I have said. If anyone should consecrate water or some other liquid in place of wine, and did not realize the defect until a long time afterward; or after having noticed it, could not have any other wine: even if he had some, he would still not be able to use it without causing great scandal, or risk to life. (Or without a similar serious inconvenience, as when one, after consecrating the Host, is suddenly faced with the danger of death from enemies, or an imminent fire, but remains secluded from scandal and contempt for the Faith.) Reg. l. 29 c. 4. (Cum ») If a Priest should die after consecrating the Host, or if through mental deficiency he loses speech, or lapses into madness, and there be no other person who can complete the sacrifice.

Si autem alius supplere et Sacerdos: infirmus Communionem suscipere potest, debet Hostia dividi, eique pars dari. Tumb. de Exped. Offering 1. 1 c. 8. * (See » . 43 sect. 4. Renzi in quaestio 46 cum Axor. Major. with c. 3 n. 40.

Mazzota t. 1 » p. 31 et Wigandt tr. 12. From 2 n. 16: Never to be able to consecrate a priest in one single species out of fear of death from without, or from another brought against this end, so that he might thus consecrate; because then he would act directly contrary to the Divine Precept, which is intrinsically evil). * I have said 2. Licitly, because either one is validly consecrated, it is certain: as is evident both from the fact of Christ, who consecrated the bread before, and from the practice of the Church, which offers the Body before the Blood to be adored. » ## DUBIUM III. ## What kind of bread should there be in the material of the Eucharist? 198 Is wheat bread alone fitting matter? 199 Not any matter is fitting for the Eucharist, I. Bread from rice, beans, etc. II.

Raw dough, or roasted, or parched. III. Bread acted upon with oil, milk, etc. What if water is not natural? IV. Hostia rubrae.

V. Corrupted bread. 200 What kind of bread is doubtful matter? Wheat, chaff, starch? What is the valid material for bread, but illicit? I. If

somewhat mixed with other matters.

II. If sluggish. Validly presumed, but illicitly they consecrate the Latins to fermenta- and the Greeks to azymo. Dub. 1. What if a Latin person were to pass through Greece, or against it? Dub. 2. Can a Latinus celebrate in fermented wine to give Viaticum?

Chapter I. Dub. III. On the essence of the Eucharist. 15 204 On the broken or spotted host. 205 On the figure of the host to be consecrated. And is it permissible to celebrate with a smaller host, namely only wheat bread, which is commonly used at banquets according to the moral judgment of men and is considered such that from wheat flour mixed with natural water and toasted or baked until it remains incorrupt in its species: because this alone is simply called bread, whereas another is not unless added to, for example, barley.

Wherefore it is resolved. 1. False is that which Cajetan taught. It is false that the Eucharist can be consecrated from any kind of bread whatsoever, provided only that it be suitable for eating; (The same is taught by D. 74 art. 4 Catech., and also by Lugo: Whose matter is wheat bread and grape wine.) It is confirmed by the Missal: Romanus, where it states: If the bread is not made from wheat flour, the Sacrament is not completed). 2. The material is not fitting for a valid consecration.

I. Bread made from rice, oats, barley, peas, beans, almonds, and other legumes, or presumed to be made from wheat, because all these are commonly believed and held to distinguish in kind from wheat. de Lugo d. 4 sess. 1. II. Raw wheat mass, or not cooked in the manner of bread, but roasted or parched, such as placentas, libums, whether they differ in species or not. (with Fill.) Bread subducted with artificial waters, or with oil, butter, milk, and eggs, or with sugar or other liquid, which is not mixed with natural water, because it is not usual bread.

Thus. 5 th. 4 c. 9. Cajet. tamen et quidam Recentiores contra hoc docent, quare est saltem materia dubia; idque confirmat Missae de Lugo d. 4 sect. i n. 4. unde qui hostias emunt, certi sint; quod aqua naturalis, et non rosacea confectae sint. IV. Similarly, the hostiae ubrae, to which letters are sealed, are not valid material matter, nor even at least doubtful; because through the admixture of cinnamon they are notably altered: this is limited if there is much cinnamon mixed in; but if it is very little, he considers probable that it would be valid matter; yet illicit. (Vide dictu de Bapt.) Bread substantially corrupted.

VI. Bread subducted by sea water. R. 58 where it itself teaches the contrary, because that which is by nature winged water. * (And when with Diana Renzius c. 1 q. 18. And I cannot discern why a bread made with water is not truly bread, as sea water is both natural and common water, congruent to what we said in Baptism n. 103. And it teaches so St. Thomas, 11om. 3 p. qu. 66 art. 4 ad 1. Indeed otherwise it must be said, if a form is given to water mixed with rosewater or any other liquid, because it would not be true bread, as the same Saint says. Bread from wheat, or spelt, or from barley is a doubtful matter: for some say that it is due to the accidental qualities on account of the sterility of the place; others distinguish it speculatively; hence it is not allowable at all, even as regards the Sacrament, because this would involve danger.

Th. 3. p. q. 74 art. 3 ad a et 5. S. Bonav. 6 p. 1 n. 4a1 dicunt siligine esse aquam triticum; sed negant Cognita, Palaus, et plures; unde Carden. apud Croix; et Renzi qu. 9 cum Bon. recte do cent, esse mortale, in siligne consectare, proet in materia dubia. Amylum autem certe non est materia apta. Croix n. 4a3. The.

Lugo, "et contra aliquos universi.") * » 4. Valid, sed illicita est materia. I. If a certain amount of grains or drops of another kind with a trilium and water are mixed together, so that nevertheless wheat and water predominate greatly, because if the greater part is not wheat and water, it will not be valid matter about which they are to be instructed who cook offerings. Good.

d. 4 q. 2 p. 1 n. 6. * (S. 3 ad 3 idem docet, dicens: si sit modica ad mixtionem alterius frumenti ad multò majorem quantitatem tritici, poterit exinde confici panis, qui est materia hujus sacramenti. If, however, there is a great mixture, suppose it to be equal or almost so, such a mixture changes the appearance; hence bread made thereby will not be the proper material. And therefore commonly they say presumptuously *. II. Mucid bread, which is disposed toward corruption, (This would be the case, if the taste were to some extent altered and then it would be mortal to use it; Palaus, and Contin.) * 5. It is equally with regard to the value of the Sacrament whether the bread be unleavened or leavened, as the Interim defines, in which Latin Churches are accustomed to have it made in unleavened bread, and Greek Churches in leavened bread, under a grave precept and mortal sin, from which there is no excuse, for instance, giving viaticum. IV. qu. 2, p. 1. Fill. tom. 4 cap. 3 qu. 8.

Card. de Lugo l.c. Et est commune cum Soto, Suarez, ..., in azymo sive fermentato pane triticeo Corpus Christi veraciter confici. Priests should consecrate in the same very day the Body of the Lord, each one according

to the custom of his own Church, whether Oriental or Occidental. Herefore N. SS. P. Bened. XIV. Even though it is confirmed by the perpetual suspension from Divine services concerning the prohibition that a Latin or Greek person may not celebrate other than according to their own rite.

But there is doubt 1. Whether a Latin may celebrate in places of Greeks with fermented bread, and whether a Greek may celebrate in places of Latins with unleavened bread? The Doctors agree that, if among the Greeks there is found a Church of Latins, in which the Latin Rite is observed, then a Latin priest should consecrate in unleavened bread; and thus conversely. Thus it is said in section 44, chapter 4, verse 9. That, n. 242. and a Doubt is: when a Latin passes through Greece (or against it). He thinks: On the contrary Vasq. d. 74 c. 3. and Aversa qu. 2 sect. 4 say, to hold him bound to celebrate in unleavened bread.

Otherwise commonly, and with great probability, Nat. 12. Antoine c. 1 q. a . In the fermentation, according to the teaching of St. Augustine, Epistle 118 (now 58), chapter 2, where he says thus: No discipline is better for a prudent and serious Christian than that he act in such a way as he sees the Church acting with which he has unfortunately come into contact. Moreover, he can also celebrate in unleavened bread, firstly because even though one acts well by following the custom of the region where it is found, yet he is not bound to do so; as they observe, c. and the Glossa on c. Quæ contra, Dist 8. Secondly, because Pope Leo, in his Epistle to Michael Caerularius, c. 29, admonishes (as is relevant), Dubitatur 2.

In casu necessitatis, ad praebendum Viaticum infirmo possit sacerdos latinus consecrare in fermentato? They affirm that the precept of receiving Viaticum ought to prevail over the precept of celebrating in unleavened bread, because, as they say, the Divine precept of receiving Viaticum should take precedence. But the common opinion denies it, and the more probable view, which Tourn. l. c. Antoine de . 66 sect. 5 hold along with Soto and Gabr. Croix n. 431. Renz. l. c. cum Palao, Secluso autem scandalo, est tantum veniale sine rationabili causa consecrarare hostiam fractam vel maculatam; nisi fractura vel macula esset enormis: tunc enim esset mortale, ut Croix n. 432. cum cum Gob. « Resp. 2.

By the precept of the Church, the bread should be consecrated in a round and intact form (in the Latin Church). I spoke in Latin, because the Greeks use a square [consecrated host], and in the particles they use a triangular one, as Arcud has it. It is permitted even in a lesser hostia, which is given to the Laics, when another cannot be used and scandal is avoided, to celebrate privately; but if there be urgent cause, even publicly on a feast day, teaches March. in Candel. 1. 4 c. 5 q. 3. de exped. Sacri. 1. 2 cap. 8 et

id quod nullum sit praeceptum neque constet de consuetudine obligante sub praecepto. Id admitti etiam causa devotionis; et consentiunt cum Gob. si absit scandalum, quod potest praecaveri monendo populum. He adds moreover: In what case it is willing to allow the adoration of a greater host that has been previously consecrated by another, namely Diana II. cc. It is not permitted however to take the lesser and leave the greater (for example, for exposition in a tabernacle), unless he himself consecrates this same Mass again, because he should communicate from his own sacrifice. Therefore the parish priest acts wrongly who, intending to renew the Eucharist, takes a host that has been consecrated by another, and places it himself consecrated back into the sanctuary or tabernacle.

Cardinalis de Lugo d. 19 sect. 4. DUBIUM IV. What kind of wine is the material of the Eucharist? What kind of wine is not suitable as material? I. Sicera etc. II.

Country. III. Vinegar. IV. Grape.

V. Decoction of must. What is a valid material but one that is illicit? I. Mustum decoctum. 207 What is a valid material but an illicit one? Mustum. II.

Wine mixed. III. An accensens? See below Qu. I.

IV. Is it frozen? See below Qu. II. 208 Is water to be mixed with wine under a grave precept? And what kind of water, and in what quantity? And whether a mixture should be made in the cup? Whether mixed water with wine is immediately converted into Blood? What quantity of water should be immixed in the cup?

What if blood falls upon the altar, a liturgical cloth, or corporal, etc.? "Resp." I. Only wine from the grapevine, as Faith teaches, and it is defined in the Florentine [text]. Wherefore resolved. The first.

It is not a fitting matter for a valid consecration » except I. Sicera, et quicumque liquor ex moris, malo- granatis, etc., sive dicatur vinum, sive non. II. Aggresses thee, sive omphacium, id est, succus ex uvis immaturis ex praesus; quia non est vinum sed in via ad vinum cuius naturam nondum induit; habet se congruentem massa cruda respectu panis. 4 c. 2 n. 5 et 6. succum tamen ex uvis passis expressum consecretur esse vinum 7 c. 12 R. 8 eo quod verum sit vinum. III.

Acetum, quia est vinum substantialiter corruptum. Ibid. And if after

(indeed, even before) the reception (post consecrationem Calicis), a doubt arises whether it was to be presumed that it was vinegar or wine, it teaches that it was wine. 2 exped. sacrif. c. 8. * (But see what is to be said in the following annotation *) IV. Grapes, or wine contained within grapes, or imbibed in a piece of bread, because it is not so much a drink as food; because that juice is not properly called wine until it has been expressed; and because in that state it does not sufficiently manifest itself to the sense by form.

Card. de Lugo d. 4 n. 11 et 12. - Sapa, seu defrutum, id est mustum ad dimidiam, seu tertiam partem decoctum; quia non est amplius vinum, nec potus, sed cibus. - Lora, id est aqua expressis aci-nis superfusa. Cardinal de Lugo, d. 4 - sect. 1 n. 9. Take notice of what is found concerning these matters in the Rubric. When the must of the Mass is corrupted by vinegar, whether through complete putrefaction or from sour and bitter sails, or expressed from unripe grapes, or even mixed with water to such an extent that the wine becomes corrupt, the Sacrament is not destroyed. But it must be noted that wine made from sour grapes is then inept for the purpose when it has no species of wine; as D. 74, art. 5, ad 3 teaches: "It is in the way of generation, and therefore does not yet have the species of wine, and on this account from it this Sacrament cannot be made."

As regards vinegar or wine, if after Consecration the Priest prudently doubts whether it was true wine, Tambur de Sacr. say this. Miss. 1. 2 c. 8 §. 5 n. 6. et cui adherent tum quia non est turbandum Sacrificium sine certo fundamento. However true it may be that La Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 535. Pasqual. qu. 318. et Aversa qu. 11 s. 16 recte censent, suppendam esse Consecrationem illam, ne Sacrificium relinquatur in periculo non integritatis, contra praeceptum faciendi Sacrificium integrum. The reasons opposed to it are weak; how indeed can possession be considered as wine when there is doubt whether at the time of Consecration there was wine or not?

On the other hand, in order to discern whether the Consecration was truly carried out, one must attend to the truth of the matter and not to conjecture. Sacramentum autem non est quidem turbandum sine certo fundamento; sed dicimus, jam certum existere fundamentum sive obligationem integrandi Sacrificium, quandò certum est dubium de Consecratione peracta. I think, however, that there is no other certain wine again to be absolutely consecrated, because then the same danger would arise of making a mutilated Sacrifice, if perchance the former matter had been truly apt: Therefore I say that this second Consecration should not be undertaken unless the former matter has not been consecrated; for it will be a just reason for repeating the Consecration

under the aforementioned condition to avoid leaving the Sacrifice mutilated. A valid consecration, but it is illicit. I.

In musto. * (In which validly consecrated is, as explained above,) *, because it is simply wine, but impure, having mixed dregs that are unmixable: hence also it impedes the precept of the Church, obliging one at least extrinsically outside necessity, what kind of defect in the old wine would have been, and according to some, even the devotion of the people; as many excuse against Suarez, who say that in certain places musty grapes are expressed in the chalice. c. II. In wine mixed with other liquors or aromatics so slightly that the nature of the wine is retained. Si vero mixtio sit immodica, erit materia dubia. III. In rising wine: because it is still wine, the bread that is moistened by it is congruous. * (See below Qu.)

I.) * IV. Even in fermented wine and in that which has been congealed: (even though on account of the authority of those who deny it, it is said to be a doubtful matter), nevertheless, because it still retains substance and the denomination of wine, and is according to its nature potable; furthermore, because Christ remains under it after consecration. Card. de Lugo l. c. il. It does not matter that frozen water is not the material of Baptism; for this essentially consists in ablution, while the Eucharist does not consist in consumption. It does not matter 2ndly that it is not proximately potable: for this is accidental, and easily removed; moreover, there is a sufficient reason in hard bread.

It is not the same in a liquid that has not yet been expressed from grapes, because since it is not wine simply and per se, its nature is not by itself potable but comestible, which does not suit frozen wine; otherwise, fasting would be broken. Bonacina loc. cit. n. 10. (Vida infra Qu. II.). - Pecot tamen, qui in congelato consecrat, idòque si hymen congelavit calix, calore manuum aut halitus aliove modo regelandus est. Fill. t. 4 - c. 3. . 5 t. 4 c. 2. - 3. The consecration is valid and licit in white wine or red wine, even though they differ presumptuously in a physical species; for both are considered simply to be wine from the vine.

Card. de Lugo d. 4. It is asked. Whether a priest sins mortally by consecrating with wine that has begun to ferment? They say in Summa de Euchar. a. 4 n. 26. tit. p. 4 n. 9. with others, then to commit a mortal sin when wine is nearly exhausted: so that there may be doubt whether the qualities of the wine have already been lost. I reverence the authority of so many DD.

But I know not how this opinion can be sustained, since it is explicitly

stated in the Rubric, title 4, number 2: "If the wine has fermented, or been corrupted, or become somewhat bitter, or must from grapes expressed, or if it was not mixed with water, or was mixed with rose-water or more acrid distilled water, the Sacrament is vitiated; but he who does this gravely sins." Therefore, the Rubric condemns as mortal sin: not only he who uses vinegar proximate to wine, but also presumptuous wine, which has begun to ferment or has become slightly sour. Verum hoc principium acrimoniae, sive accescentiae intelligendum est juxta id quod docet S. 74 art. 5 ad 2: Potest tamen confici (Sacrificium) de vino accescenti, congruent et de pane, qui est in vid ad corruptionem licet peccet conficiens. Therefore, different degrees are to be considered in regard to acerbic wine, some outside, some inside: the way of corruption. Hence, the rubric should be understood according to St. Thomas when wine or bread has already entered the limits of corruption, such that it has reached the beginning of acidity, as is expressed by the Cardinal.

Lamb. He further says in the Fourth: If necessity should urge for celebrating Mass, or if the Priest cannot omit the Sacred Species without sin, as happens among Regulars who are bound to celebrate according to their rule and have no power to have other wine, those using such wine do not sin... Although the use of such wine is contrary to the reverence of the Sacrifice, yet that lack of reverence is not imputed to the celebrant, but to the Superior or Minister, who is the cause of that voluntary fault. Moreover, when it is so near to vinegar that there is doubt whether it has lost the nature of wine, the Consecration will indeed be in doubt; but in the rubric of such a kind of Consecration it is held as certain, since it is said there that the Sacrament is made: Therefore according to the rubric and according to the sentence which other authors hold, as Abelly says in the 3rd section of his treatise on the Eucharist n. 4, it must absolutely be said that a mortal sin is committed by adding to wine what is certain and valid matter, not only when the matter is doubtful, but even presumptuously when it is certainly valid, because it is considered illicit on account of irreverence towards the Sacrament. Neither does Suarez, cited against his adversaries for his own opinion, dissent when he says that grave sin can be committed in this regard on account of doubt or irreverence. And expressly it teaches this, D. 5 ad 2, where it says: It has power to consecrate (the Sacrament) from wine that is in process of becoming vinegar, congruent also and bread, which is on the way toward corruption; although he who consecrates sins by doing so.

Nevertheless, probabilistically say Gob. and Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 546, that it is licit without scruple, insofar as men of probity commonly do, to use wine only slightly heated or not noticeably acid, when another wine is lacking. They also add. It is questioned. Is frozen wine a valid material? There are

three opinions.

The first opinion denies what Lessius holds in III p. q. 74 art. 5 n. 24; also Armilla, c. 1 q. 35 and probable Cap. I. Dub. IV. On the essence of the Eucharist. 25 parts. title 4 number 34. Reason (as they say), because the bread to be consecrated should be suitable for consumption, just as wine is for drinking; but frozen wine is not a fit drink.

Nevertheless, the second opinion is more accurate in its affirmation, and this is held by Sporer n. 159. Renzius l. c. cum Pontio; Pasq. D. 45 sert. i in fine. Reason why frozen wine, although actually not drinkable, is nevertheless drinkable by its nature, it is congruent to hard bread that is comestible. This is clearly proven by Rubr., where St. Pius V thus decrees: If in winter blood should congeal in the chalice, the chalice should be wrapped in heated cloths until it liquefies. Therefore, the Pontiff supposes that through congelation the species of wine is minimally corrupted; otherwise, there would cease to be the blood of Christ there; for once wine has lost its nature, it cannot regain it again, since according to the common axiom of the philosophers, a regress from privation to habit does not occur.

Therefore, frozen wine is true wine. To this reasoning, how one might respond. The third opinion, which n. 34 holds and teaches, is that the matter is doubtful, since the first opinion lacks all probability. Moreover, I hold that it is not licit for anyone to be consecrated in frozen wine; at least on account of reverence towards the Sacrament alone. But if the wine has been congealed, and afterwards liquefies, it seems very probable with . • Resp, 2.

By consecrating wine, it should be mixed with water, not out of necessity of the Sacrament, but rather through a grave precept under mortal penalty according to Card. de Lugo, De Euch., d. 15, 5, 2 n. 22. (Cum Catech.) Ron. n. 16.) Idque ceremonialiter, et in ordine ad sacrificium. It is certain, as is evident from * (And previously it was prescribed in c. 2 de Consec. dist. 2). Whether however this precept is a presumptively divine one? They affirm and Vasquez: Both are probable.) Now whether this water is immediately converted into Blood, or not, the Scholastics dispute in dist. 4, sess. 3. (See what will be said shortly under number 209.) Undoubtedly resolved.

1. If this mixture is omitted, the secretio nevertheless remains valid, even though it is illicitly mortal. Thus all commonly. 2. Natural water is to be mixed, and but a drop or two, as Florentine has it; yet so that it may be

perceptible, and at most not exceed one-third part of the wine: otherwise it would render the mixture doubtful. But whoever should mix rose-water or some other artificial essence, even though in necessity and validly consecrate it, would nevertheless commit a mortal sin.

Because of which reason also it considers mortal to mix heat: yet this seems too harsh to some in certain places where he himself adds that if such a custom exists in the very coldest regions so as not to fear that the wine might freeze, then it may be done without any sin. He considers mortal sin to be committed by one who mixes warm water: which, however, seems too harsh to some in certain cases. That mixture must be made not in a barrel or amphora, nor any other vessel, but in the very chalice itself, neither at home, but in the very sacred place, as is commonly done, either before the offering, or certainly immediately before the Sacred [moment], as is done by some: and this either by the very priest himself in private Mass; or by the subdeacon in solemn Mass; for it is not sufficient if the layman dilutes it. Bon. l. c. * (Cum S.). If this mixing has been omitted, and it is noted before the consecration of the chalice, then still it must be done according to the manner if after.

Bon. l. c. n. 5. » 5. This precept concerning the mixture does not extend to that which is done after Communion for the washing of the mouth and fingers. See regarding these matters the Roman Missal, and likewise Bonaventure, Day 4, Question 2, Part 4, Treatise 4, Chapter 2. It is asked I. Is water mixed with wine converted into the Blood of Christ?

And whether immediately? It is not of Faith that water be converted into blood, for Innocentius III said so in c. cum Marthae, de Cel. The negative opinion is more probable to be affirmed today as the common sentiment among Theologians, just as all teach with St. Thomas, in article 8 of question 74, who says that the opposite opinion cannot subsist. Regarding however the mode of conversion, some said that since wine is converted to blood, thus water should be converted to water which flowed from the side of Christ; but the same holy doctor in loco citato says: Nor can this be rationally said, namely, that according to this water would separately be consecrated by wine, while wine is consecrated by bread. Others however, as the same Saint [Thomas] in Question 11, Article 7, Number 2.

Gonet Frassen t. 11 p. 94 et communissime Thomistæ et Scottistæ cum dicunt aquam immediate converti in vinum et mediatè in Sanguinem Christi. Reason, because it is not converted into Blood except matter consecrable, which is only wine from the vine, according to the Florentine and Tridentine Councils; whence water cannot be converted into Blood unless first converted into wine. They do not object to the Rubric of the

Missal, which commands that water be immediately appointed in the Chalice before Consecration; if this case occurs, it seems that the conversion of water into wine cannot so quickly take place, and then there would be a danger of idolatry, because an un consecrated matter would be adored. For they respond that it is fitting to adore only the substantial content which is represented by the cup, namely the Blood of Christ, and not other things which are not thus represented; just as a fly, should it happen to fall into the cup, is not truly adored. However, others, as on page five, paragraph three hundred ninety-nine, conclusion three, chapter two, section two.

Lugo D. 4 sect. 3 cum Praepos. Renzi c. 1 q. 39. cum Alano, Baronio, ac Con. (et probabile putat) sentiunt aquam immediate transire in sanguinem Christi. And they prove it by authority of the Fathers, who say that from wine and water the Blood is made. Thus says St. Jerome: He forms His Blood from wine and water mixed together. St. Ambrose: Vinum cum aqua in calice missum fit Sanguinis Conspectu.

One may see other Fathers at Lugo n. 48. They approve the second reason, because according to recent physicists, transmutation of elements is denied, since they can be well separated by their own art, as we said in Baptism no. 104. And to this opinion Innocent supports in his dictum c. Cum Martha, when there it says that it is more probable for water to be transmuted into blood with wine, as the Pontiff there states. He does not say that water is converted into wine, but that water with wine remains; therefore, before Consecration, water remains water. They do not say that it is an obstacle that another material than wine cannot be converted into Blood; for they respond that if mixed with a small amount of water, true common wine is made, whence the whole material becomes consecrable, just as if in wheat bread a small amount of other grain were mixed, the whole material is consecrated, as stated in n. 201, and it teaches D. 3 ad 3 that (as he says) a small mixture does not dissolve the species.

Therefore, the same must be said about water mixed with wine. Both opinions are sufficiently probable. 210 Quære II. What quantity of water is to be mixed with the wine in the chalice? Habert t. 5 p. 378 dicit: non esse probandos Sacerdotes, qui unam aquæ guttulam infundunt; Sed hoc sine scrupulo fieri posse censent Bon. D. 4 q. 2 p. 4 n. 4.

Wigbert et pro certo hoc habet. 45 sectio 3. From the Decree of Eugenius IV, which said: A little water is accustomed to be mixed with wine before consecration for the Mass. And from . 74 art. 8 ad 1: where it says, it is not required that the quantity of water be great, Chapter I. Doubt. V.

On the essence of the Eucharist. But suffice it that it be susceptible to corruption. On the contrary, and Diana par. 3 tr. 4 R. 47 pro-habiliter dicunt, sine scrupulo posse immitti aquam usque ad octavam partem; et Lugo D. 4 n. 38. . 4 a. 3 n. 3 ac Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 439. cum Gob. (contra Bernal.) usque ad quintam partem, quia (ut ajunt) nullum vinum adeo debile creditur, ut tam modica aqua corrumpatur. But rather, it seems that this is proven from c. Perniciosus, 13 de Cel. Miss. where Honorius III merely prescribes: More wine than water to be put in (the) cup. And in the Council of Triurient (according to p. 180) it was thus stated: Two parts of wine, one part of water.

However in practice 29. ll. cc. do not admit this opinion of the third part, unless (as they say, Escob. et . This however, it is to be noted what is found in the Rubrica (tit. 10 n. 12): If through negligence something of Christ's Blood should fall, whether upon the earth or upon a table, if the tongue licks it up and the place itself is scraped clean as much as necessary, and the abrasion is burned; ashes thereof are to be poured back into the sanctuary. If vinegar has fallen upon the stone of the altar, let the Priest lap up the drop, and the place be well washed, and the washing be cast into the sanctuary. If upon the altar cloth, and unto the third ladle the liquor thereof hath come, three times let the altar cloths be washed; and with the chalice placed thereupon, and the water of the ablution let it be cast into the sanctuary. And the same is said there, if Blood falls upon the Corporal, vestments, or carpet. ## DUBIUM.

V. What conditions are required for the consecration of the matter? For valid consecration it is required I. that the matter be morally and sensibly present. Hence, a Host is validly consecrated in the Ciborium closed up, or in darkness, etc. 50 Lib. VI. Quae conditiones ad materiae Consecrationem requirantur? Draw. III. Of the Eucharist. 213 Nevertheless, the material is invalidly consecrated after the back or wall.

II. Remote matter. III. Material very small. 214 It is required that the matter be certain and determined. 215 Is the host consecrated by an unaware Priest? And whether a single drop of wine separated out. 216 The consecration is valid.

I. Materia valdè modica. If the Priest determines in any manner. II. If a Priest determines in any way. If he thinks there to be a lesser number of hosts. III.

If after he has directed them to be consecrated, he forgets them. So, what

if the Ciborium is left outside the corporal due to oblivion? IV. If the host is brought forward after the Oblation. What is required for a lawful Consecration? In which cases does the Celebrant sin by consecrating? Resp. 1. For a valid consecration there are required two conditions; The first is, that the matter to the Consecrating Priest be present both morally and sensibly. Thus indeed generally, and it is certain.

The reason is sought both from the institution of Christ and the words form, Hoc, et Hic, which would not be verified if they were demonstrative: but also from the perpetual practice of the Church, never consecrating or even blessing absent things: and also by reason of the sacrifice, which requires a present victim. V. Bonaventurae, de quarto, quaestio secunda, articulus sextus. ## Under what resolution? 212 » 1. The wine is validly consecrated in a cup covered, that is, in a vase, or a chalice closed: and the bread in a basket; these are validly in a ciborium, or in a heap hidden under others covered, or otherwise concealed, for example, under a corporal, or a pall, or even in the Missal, as Suarez states, lib. 5, tract. 4, cap. 2 (where this doubt might seem to arise: and certainly he would gravely sin who thus concealed or hidden consecrated). Likewise validly are presented to the host present by a blind man, or another priest in darkness. * (It is common with Et sufficit, if from the relation of another it is certified the presence of the matter, as Sot. The reason for all this is that presence and sensibility are not required for the material to be seen or touched or struck by sound words; hence, it is commonly disapproved of the practice of those who move their mouth close by, such as blowing breath into a cup and breathing upon bread, provided only that it may appear either in itself or in something else, whether entirely, or within its container or vessel destined for containing it.

V. Bon. d. 4 q. 2 p. 5. » 2. It is invalidly consecrated I. Materia post parietem, 213 » or after being placed on the back, or enclosed in the tabernacle, » as Fül teaches.

Good question. Book 2, page 6 and others. The reason is that it is morally considered absent; since it cannot be demonstrated through "Tò," "Hoc," and "Hic"; nor does the wall have itself as a container or coverer. II. Material is very profligate, for example one hundred paces distant, even though it may appear so. The reason is the same.

What, however, constitutes sufficient proximity is uncertain, and depends on the prudent judgment of those skilled in moral matters. Henriq. 1. 8 c. 34 docet, 20 aut 30 passuum. * (Putant Lugo et Gabr. apud Consecrationem in 20 passus esse certam) *, quod Vide Schol. III. Material so slight that it cannot be perceived by sense: firstly because it cannot be

demonstrated, and secondly because the Sacrament ought to be a sign of the sensible. Ità quod intellige, si non sit in toto, sed extra illud, quia in toto etiam minimæ ejus particulæ consecrantur: ut constat ex secunda conditio est, ut materia sit certa, et consecrantis intentione, et in individuo determinata.

It is common among Bonaventure and others: firstly because this requires the pronouns Hoc and Hic; secondly because actions are concerning singulars, which should be certain and determined. See Bon. loc. cit. p. 5. Wherefore it is resolved. 1. Invalidly consecrates who desires merely to consecrate the third or middle part of the hostia, without determining it, or from many, e.g., twenty present ones, designating merely four or five; because there is no reason why one rather than another should be consecrated.

Item, qui ex multis hostiis intenderet illas consecrarare, vel illas partes hostiarum, aut vini, quas Deus elegerit, aut Titus designàrit, aut partes illas, quæ fractis speciebus sunt mansuræ in continuo, non quæ excident: quia non est materia definita. Bon. l. c. p. 5. » 2. The hostia is not consecrated by an unwitting priest, whether in corporali (yet following the accumulation), or infra illud 3 et alii. The reason is because it is not determined in the mind of the priest, whose will does not extend to the unknown.

Similarly, drops are not consecrated which adhere externally to the cup, because they are not stretched out; rather, as is more probably taught . . . 5 t. 4 c. 9. 3 contra Tann. et Bon. nor those drops which adhere internally, for it seems that the intention of the Church was this, and consequently also that of the Priest, to consecrate what has been in a manner continuous in the cup. Wherefore, that there may not be occasion for solicitude regarding the drops to be delergeren, it will be well for the Priest once and for all to intend that they not be consecrated, just as he does not intend the small particles adhering to the Hosts. See 3 » m. R. 16 and p. 3 t. 4 R. 32. Withdrawal.

A 7 E. 6 ubi docet: Sacerdotem vi pura: hic tantum intendere id consecrare, quod per modum unius continui potabiles est in calice, ideòque guttulas illas non consecrari. The said opinion is probable from the Decretals, lib. 5, tit. 4, cap. 2, num. 15. It is asked, whether the drops of wine, which are separated in the chalice, are consecrated when the Priest does not intend anything concerning them? Others deny it, as Bussem says. Others affirm, Cap. I.

Doubt. V. On the essence of the Bachelor. 55 as Cross 4. 6 p. 1 n. 449. with Monet. Platel. in Croix ibid., sic: ut sacerdos advertens statim ante consecrationem tales guttas, si sint vicinae, admisciat; si vero remotae, vel absterget (quod ait Tanner apud Dub. laudare expedire), vel excludat intentione. But Croix says that it is licit to presume and include them in intention, so that there may not be wine in the chalice which has not been consecrated.

Thus Croix says presumptuously that it is licit to include them in intention, against Busemb., so that the Priest may consecrate small particles adhering to the Host, but not those separated on the Paten or Corporal; nor does it hinder that by taking them one would violate the fast, for then it seems more fitting to guard against irreverence towards the Sacrament than to observe the privation of fasting. If, however, the mites are in the ciborium, let him intend to consecrate them, lest there be any danger of their being lost. • 3. The consecration is valid, I. If a Priest intends to consecrate from many hosts present merely five, he determines them; or all except the lowest and highest pile; or all pairs, for example, the second, fourth, sixth, if they are arranged in order, and the point of beginning is determined henceforth: which nevertheless will be a grave sin. And siquidem hoc vel alio casu non consecrata miseantur consecratis, totus cumulus ad altare est deferendus; ut sacerdos intendat consecrarare nonconsecratas; vel potius totum cumulum consecret sub conditione, si non sint consecratae.

And this ought rather to be done, because in consecrating unconsecrated hosts, there is a lack of true determination of matter; nor can that word be fulfilled whereby all hosts should be consecrated under condition, so that they are validly consecrated: as Lugo says, D. 4 n. 136. with what follows in the same place. And si putet, unam, vel duas, vel sex hostias con secreandas adesse, cum sint pluris; sive à se, sive ab alio positæ; quia error speculativus, et privatus non obstat intentioni practice, et absolutæ consecrandi omnes præsentes, quam tamquam ecclesie consuetudini conformem, quisque censetur habere implicite ut docent Sylv. Henry and .) * Wherefore if the Priest observes after consecration there to be two simultaneous loaves, each one he will consider as consecrated, as the Missal has it. If however before Consecration, after having offered, he separates one from the rest, and either himself or another takes it afterwards as blessed bread. III.

» If anyone shall have brought more hosts to the altar, or reasonably diverted them, so as to be carried by another for consecration, or before the sacrifice was warned about their being consecrated in the already placed upon the altar. Reason; all are consecrated, for if while he is consecrating he does not remember them sufficiently clearly, or conceals

his presumptuous offering so that it is not exposed to Oblation, provided they be present either in the body or at least on the altar. Thus Reginald. L. 27 n. 19. 5 f. 2 c. 2. Bon. l. 1 d. 4 q. 2 p. 2. et alii ab ipsa, citati, estque sententia in praxi tuta. Because the intention proceeding with regard to those things virtually and severely separates.

When the Ciborium placed for consecration is set by the cleric on the corporal, and you turn your attention to it, and now intend that it be consecrated, it is certain what will follow, namely that afterwards you will not advert to it. It is a common opinion, as Croix says in lib. 6, par. i, n.:456; cum c. 4, n. 125, with Gavant, and Suarez. But it is to be considered whether a Ciborium left in oblivion outside the Corporal is to be deemed consecrated? The first opinion, which they call probable, affirms this, because, as they say, the will to consecrate already existed; and it was not withdrawn. Nevertheless, the common and more probable opinion denies it, saying that.

Reason why: because, since the intention to consecrate apart from the Corporal was a grave sin, you do not presume to have had that. But because the first opinion does not seem improbable when the matter is in doubt, reasonably says Benedict. XIV. concerning the Sacrifice. Miss. 1. 3 e. 18 n. 6. Chalice anew to be consecrated: or as Tutius says, those particles are to be taken in practice after the blood; and I add after the ablution but before the purification, because the remains of the Blood certainly are the Sacrament, but those hostiae in the Chalice are doubtful.

They, however, think that Tourn. and Croix 1.c. can be presumed to be consecrated anew in another Mass under a condition: But this does not please me, because it does not seem there is a just reason for their consecration under a condition, since they can already be used. • IV. If small hostia are brought by the priest for distribution to the communicants after the Offering has been made (as added in question 11, section 12 before the beginning of the Preface), if they can lawfully be consecrated as a supplement to the Offering through mental presence, according to Gavant and Tann. de exped. sacrific. 1:2 c. 5. (And this is also the intent of the Canon, as with Gob.). Burg. Fourthly, Diana; and Salm, when more would remain without Communion; and Blessed [or: and Benedict] agreed. XIV. concerning the Sacrifice.

M. 1. 3 c. 18 n. 5. If however there remained only one, the Code rather recommends that a larger part of the Host be given to him; which can now licitly be done, as Croix says n. 508 with St. Anthony, etc. And it suffices for the reason if he is about to communicate, although he should have awaited communion. • Resp. 2. For the licit consecration of the material, it

is required that the quantity not be greater than what can properly be consumed in due time; because a danger would arise lest the species腐烂了 Bonaventurae I. quaestio 2. That it may not deviate from the use of the Church, especially as prescribed in the Missal. Whereupon this matter is resolved.

The sin I. He who opens not the vessel wherein hostiae are to be offered does not depart from the usage of the Church, especially as prescribed in the Missal. II. Who consecrates the matter posited outside of the corporeal. III.

Who intends that the lips adhering externally to the calix be consecrated, which would be grave; as for those internally adherent, it is doubtful, since it does not sufficiently appear from the mind of the Church, towards which the decree of Gavan exhorts, part 2, treatise 7, that they be wiped clean, a practice approved by custom. He, however, who omits this, teaches that he does not sin. He who so determined before consecration; I do not wish to consecrate applied hosts, unless they be remembered at the time of Consecration, or at least at the time of Oblation. Ita 3. Even though Tamb, in the matter of the expediency of sacrifice c. 1 § 3, considers this case such that no sin is acknowledged.

DUBIUM VI. ## What is the Form of consecration: of the Eucharist? What words signify the essence in the Consecration of bread? And what form is that of the wine? And whether the words should be spoken as if they were simultaneously uttered and significant? What form would be illicit? What is invalid? And what about doubtful cases? 222 Qu.

I. In consecration of bread, certain words are required: He who has been endowed; etc. II. In consecration of the chalice, may all the words be of the essence? What.

III. What do To Hoc and Hic signify? What does To Hoc, and Hic signify? IV. Is the Eucharist to be consecrated if the word 'Est' is omitted? See further regarding the variation in words.

What if the Priest is distracted while consecrating? Responde. It is double, one bread, and it is: this: Hoc est enim corpus meum: where all are from essence, except for that one; whose omission is venial (Cum Suarez, etc., apud Sed non improbabitur Roncaglia, et Concina damnum de mortali. For it does not seem that a grave matter should be lightened by any slight addition whatsoever. The discussion deliberates on opposed matters.) Another is wine, and this is: This is indeed the chalice of my blood, the

new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which is poured out for you and for many, in order to effect the remission of sins. Whereas, although the opinion of St. Bonaventure is more probable and more common.

Sararius, Bellarmine, and others against S. Thomas and Thomists, that the essentials are only these: Hic est calix sanguinis mei, or, Hic est sanguis meus, or their equivalents; yet grievously would they sin who should omit any of the rest or change them. But the form should be presented formally in the person of Christ, and significatively, or assertively * (That is to say simultaneously recitatively, and significatively, namely referring to the words of Christ, and applying their significance to the present matter, namely to the bread and wine, which the priest holds in his hands, so that it may be changed into the Body, and Blood of Christ; and this both with St. Thomas 78 art. 5-)*, and not only recitatively or historically, although what precedes in the Canon is said only recitatively or historically. V. Card. de Lugo d. 11 s. 5. ## Wherefore resolved. « 1. It is valid but illicit, I.

If secretly saying: This is bread; this is drink; this is olive, or these things, or the mere content under these appearances, is my body, or my blood. Bon. l. c. p. 1. II. If he says; this is the chalice of the new testament in my blood, as St. John has it in chapter 22. III.

This is my body, which I have taken from the Virgin: this is my blood of infinite value. This is my body, this is my blood, or, this is my blood. The reason for this is because the same sense remains, and there is no substantial change. Book Chapter 1 verse 2. The consecration will be invalid if you say: I.

Here (word-for-word: ad-) is my body. If however Tò, Hix, is placed masculinely for neuter, it counts, otherwise it does not conform to Grammar. c. 5 n. 3.) II. This body is mine: This blood is mine. Behold my body. » Behold my blood.

IV. Hoc fit, vel hoc sit corpus meum: vel hic panis conversatur in corpus meum, vel hic ponitur corpus meum. V. hoc fit, vel hoc est corpus meum: vel hie panis conversus est in corpus meum, » vel hic ponitur corpus meum. That is my body: that is my blood. VI.

This is my true substance, or, this is the body according to the letter page 3. The doubt concerning the consecration will be I. This is my body: This is my blood. II. This is my flesh: which however, he thinks to be efficacious.

III. This is my flesh: which yet he thinks to be efficacious. According to certain forms from St. Luke, a case brought forth. V. l. 29 n. 33. It is asked I. In consecration of bread are required those words: Qui pridie, etc.? Ambrosius Catharinus, according to Haberi (t. 5 p. 388), defended that consecration could be completed through antecedent prayers, and that the words of Christ should only be recited historically as a command; but this opinion is rejected by Saint Pius V in the Rubrics where it states after the saying has been pronounced: (that the form of the Body are those words): Hoc est enim Corpus meum.

It is said: If however, in a semi-proletarian form of the body, the Priest should die because the Consecration has not been made, it is not necessary that Mass be supplanted by another. Therefore, Consecration is not accomplished except through the words: Hoc est etc. This is confirmed by the Decree of Eugene, in which it is stated: The form of this Sacrament are the words of the Saviour, by which He completes this Sacrament; for when the Priest speaks thus in the person of Christ, He accomplishes the Sacrament. Therefore, the Sacrament is not consecrated unless by the words of Christ, which certainly are no other than these: Hoc est etc. Scotus however in 4 d. 8 q. 2 ex n. 5 does not doubt that indeed the form of the Consecration of bread and wine are the words: Hoc est corpus etc. Hic est calix etc. But if only these words are pronounced, excluding those others, Qui pridie etc., he doubts whether Consecration takes place, and then says that the Sacrament is under the condition of being adored. Reason, because the words, Hoc est etc., pronounced without precedents by themselves do not signify the Body of Christ, but the body of the priest; whence it is necessary that through the preceding words be signified that the priest speaks in the person of Christ. And this judgment followeth the Angels. v.

Eucharistia n. 24 Dupas-quier t. 7 p. 385. And Resp. ac Frassen tr. 11 p. 122 v. Indeed, they say that it is devoid of all probability. Others commonly teach otherwise, as Gonet in loco citato and Lugo in Decretum lib. 11 n. 36 (who rejects the opinion of Scotus) do: namely, that for Consecration alone the words suffice: Hoc est etc. This is proven from the Decree of Eugene, where it is said that Consecration occurs only through the words of Christ: The form of this Sacrament consists in the words of the Savior, by which He completes the Sacrament; for when the Priest speaks in the person of Christ, He completes the Sacrament. Et ut sacerdos loquatur in persona Christi, sufficit quod corpus Christi satis designetur ex institutione Christi et ex intentione sacerdotis, prout si rex aliqua instituerat verba, quae quoties dicerentur a judice repraesentarent personam regis, hoc ipsa quo a judice proferrentur repraesentant personam

regis.

This indeed is a common and most probable opinion; but I dare not call it improbable on account of its opposition: rather more so because it is found in Rubrica T. 10 n. 3. et alibi; for when the form is to be rejected on account of an uncertain matter, or because the form has been semiprolonged elicitly, it is precipitately decided that the priest should begin with those words: Qui pridie etc., and similarly etc. Question II. In consecratione calicis sola verba, 223 Hic est calix sanguinis mei, sint de essentia? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Gonet, Man., tomo 6, p. 284, and . Antonino, Sylvest. Rich. ar. etc., qui dicunt, omnia verba sequentia Novi et aeterni Testamenti ad essentiam pertinere: Et pro hac sententia videtur esse D. Thomas in 4 d. 8 qu. 2 a. 2, ubi ait: Et ideè illa quae sequuntur sunt essentialia Sanguini, provit in hoc Sacramenta consecratur, et ideò oportet quod sint de substantia forma.

Therefore Gonet says: if those words are essential to the blood, they are presumptively essential to the form. The reason for this proposition is that the Eucharist is instituted not only to signify the body and blood of Christ through the mode of food and drink, but also presumptively to explain the virtue of the passion of Christ, namely the remission of sins, which is obtained through the effusion of the Blood according to the New Testament, etc. Therefore, the subsequent words, which express this virtue, must be said to pertain to the essence as form. The censeutor, however, says 31: Not all subsequent words are essential; for the word "Alterni" is virtually included in those of the New Testament, and the words "Mysterium Fidei" are included in them; "Who for you will be poured out," etc. The second opinion is more common, which the Scotus holds in the fourth book, eighth question, second article. Petroc. to. 3 p. 326 q. 2 t. 5 p. 430 Lugo D. 11 n. 60 cum Bellarm. cum S. Bon. et Contens, Probant i ex verbis D. Pauli i ad Cor. 11. This new covenant is the New Testament in my blood.

Wherefore they say that it is incredible that the Apostle would have omitted anything essential to the form. They are prohibited on two grounds, because these alone signify the presence of the blood of Christ under the species of wine; whereas the other relates to the integrity of the form but not to the essence. And they hold that this was the mind of St. Thomas, namely those who affirm these propositions, since the Holy Doctor, when he speaks of the first words (as in question 78, article 1), says that they regard the essence; but when he speaks of the subsequent ones, he says that they regard the substance as form. This explanation, however, whether it is true according to the mind of St. Thomas, is not sufficiently perceived; hence Petrocor. very well says in this question that

the opinion of the Angelic Doctor is greatly doubtful. Both these opinions are collectively probabile, but in practice it is certain that a priest would gravely sin if he did not utter all the words which are contained in the consecration of the chalice; and, if perchance he had said only the first words, he ought undoubtedly to repeat the whole form under the condition of integrity, as rightly pointed out by Nos.: usit. reg. 4.

And this all should be said according to where it is said: If he has withdrawn (the priest) from populating the form with blood, then the chalice should be filled again with wine, and over the same chalice he should repeat the entire form (understand under the condition that if perhaps already he has spoken the words, "This is the chalice of my blood"). In a similar manner, etc. Or it could offer the entire form over another prepared chalice, and take for itself the host consecrated first by the priest, and the blood and itself consecrate, and thereafter use the remaining chalice partially consecrated. Question is raised III. What do the words Hoc, and d. 58 sect. 7 signify? Holzmann n. 272., qui edit Scotum, Sporer, et alios communiter, quod verbum Hoc vel Hic signifi- cent: hoc ens, quod est cibus, est corpus meum; hic calix, sive hic potus, est sanguis meus; omnis enim propositio in fine prolationis habet suam veritatem, et effectum.

It is asked forthwith. An Eucharistia conficiatur dicendo tantum: Hoc enim corpus meum: affirmat Bernal., dicens quod verbum est in latino idiomate sane subintelligatur. Others commonly and meritously deny this at Croix, l. 6, p. 1, n. 19. For although it may sometimes be sufficiently understood from other added words; nevertheless, this is by no means perceived from the proposition itself, since here there are no other added words which would denote that the word is hidden. But here it is to be noted that if the change in words were such as this, which is found in the Rubrica Missalis (title 5 n. 1): If anyone should diminish or impair anything from the form of consecration... and these words did not signify the same thing, the Sacrament would not be completed.

If however anything were added that would not change the signification, it would indeed be completed, but very gravely: a sin would be committed. The Consecration is valid, however, if one says: Hoc est corpus meum, vel copus meum; as Croix l. 6 p. i n. 36. cum; pariter ac diximus n. 110. de Baptismo, ex c. Retulerunt Dist. 4 de sufficit enim, ut verba forma habeant sensum à Christo intentum; secus si alium sensum haberent, ut si quis diceret, Hic (ad ver bi a- liter prolato) est corpus meum, prout docet S. Validè praesumptum consecrarret, qui ad- deret verba sensum non corrumpentia, v. gr. This is my real body. Thus, if one were to say: This is my figured body. And similarly would invalidly consecrate it, if anyone

were to say: This body is mine, as the Bonites say in the Council.

Antoine, et Eibel, quia per haec verba non significaretur transubstantiatio panis in corpus Christi. They say that if for chalice he says calix, let him say calis, as Henry says. If for blood, let him say If for blood, let him bring forth blood; (and Sotus excuses this from all guilt, even though diligence in bringing forth is omitted: but better that Diana, Leand, etc., excuse only from a mortal sin apud) Reason, because in these remains the form and substantial significance, since commonly at that time the bread is truly perceived as the cup, and thus for the others. Note must be taken that if the Priest is distracted in making the Sacraments, it is hardly possible for the Sacrament to become invalid on account of the minister's distraction; unless the distraction were total, says Croix lib. 6 p. i n. 85. But we have pronounced that this limitation is by no means probable, n. 14 de c. Sed ibidem.

But it must be noted that the words of consecration should be repeated minimally, unless there is a very probable doubt whether the priest has omitted something, as the rubric states in title 5 n. 2: "He who celebrates should not consider himself bound to say those things commonly said in consecration, and therefore should not be troubled." Si tamen certo ei constet, se omisisse aliquid eorum, quae sunt de necessitate Sacramenti, resumat formam. If however there is a very probable doubt that something essential has been omitted, he should repeat the form, at least under a tacit condition. ## DUBIUM VII. ## For how long does Christ remain in the Eucharist? 225 How much time will the species last? 226 When is grace received? 227 What if the priest disposes himself between the approaches? 228 Is more grace received if both species are taken, or a greater quantity of matter? 229 What if wine consecrated is poured into other wine or liquid? « Resp. 1. It remains under the species having been taken apart, and even in any of its smallest parts; until such a change occurs that the accustomed substance of bread and wine is corrupted. Thus it is commented upon by St. Thomas.

And it is certain. It is certain among all, at least within the space of hour species to be changed in all. Nevertheless, he rightly pointed out 4, that according to quality: stomachs more or less warm and/or robust consume species in a different manner. Moreover, speaking generally, Lugo D. 19 n. 54 states that he had thought many physicians consulted by himself in Rome to have species within a minute corrupted and in. A priest within the middle quadrans: this is approved by Bernal according to Croiz l. 6 p. 1 n. 476.

But Arriaga ibid. considers that in the laic it should be consumed within 5.

Father and Hail, and after which the priest is stripped of his vestments. At least after the quadrant from the Communion, presumed in the Sacerdote, Lugo holds it certain, and Croix agrees that healthy species are corrupted. 26 « 1. Grace is given in the first mastication presumptively; hence the reward of the part, since it is the whole Sacrament. Man-duction autem dicitur trajectio ex ore versus stom-ac-hum. etsi alii dicant, gratiam tum primum dari, cum pars aliqua est in stomachum recepta. et de Lugo d. 12 s. 9.

» 2. Species are not to be retained in the mouth for so long as they completely perish: because then Christ will not be eaten, nor will the grace of the Sacrament be conferred; neither if you should die while the host is still in the mouth. ». c. contra V. Bon. d. 3 q. 5 p. 2 n. 2. 3.

If anyone had taken a part of wine or of the host while indisposed, and then prepared himself, he would still receive grace in the consumption of another part. * (This is because at that time the Eucharist still has the power to confer grace by the work itself,) * which is why someone presumptuously thought, as stated in canon R. 96 from Nug. V. Si quis partem vini vel hostiae sumpsisset indispositus, et deinde se disponeret, acciperet adhuc gratiam in sumptione alterius partis. Card. de Lugo, d. 12, s. 2, n. 46, 53 et 64. "where that is subsequently denied." V.

» » 4. It does not seem reprehensible for a layman to consider that there is a priest who can communicate under both species so that he may think that more grace is given under both species than under one: because this is not improbable, as Vasquez teaches. Mar. Card. de Lugo d. 12 s. 3 et alii * (Cum Alensi, Hurt. Leon. ; » Sota etc. Both are probable :) * » so that devotion of him who takes much matter to composition may not be wasted too quickly in the stomach, and thus Christ may remain longer with him, and grace increase more abundantly: which is not improbable if the disposition of the subject be made better; as Suarez teaches, Con.

Item R. 97. * (Idem sentiunt Gonet tom. 6 p. 306 Lugo D. 12 n. 48. cum cum Reg. Master. Bosco, and others; likewise R. 97. n. 6, et 12 et 13, who reasonably consider this probable. Ratio, quia, ut ait Florentinum, hoc Sacramentum institutum est per modum cibi, unde congruent cibus toti tempore, quo in stomaco manet, corpus nutrit, ita semper et pariter in corpore manet Eucharistia, nutrii animam augendo gratiam. Here however note it forthwith after Decretum 8: O. has condemned the abuse whereby communicants are given more than one particle simultaneously, or a larger portion at once.) * » » 5.

If species rejected through vomiting, should such exist, truly are capable of

existing under them in a state of hunger or wine, they are worthy of adoration; and if again they are taken, grace is again conferred; this Oard de Lugo teaches in the aforementioned place number 53. » » 6. Even though, if a little of consecrated wine is mixed perfectly with another liquid, to such an extent that no trace of the substance of wine remains, Christ ceases to be there; yet, if it is mixed with another wine, even of the same species, He does not cease to be there. C. de Lugo d. r. sec. 3. Wherefore, if a drop consecrated should fall into a cask of wine of the same kind, that entire wine must henceforth be used for the sacrifice; although some say that it can be drunk by the laity.

They say moreover, and Bernard in Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 474, that Christ designates to be pre-sensed, if a drop of consecrated wine is poured into another wine not consecrated but more potent, or into another liquid in which the species of wine is corrupted. In dubio autem, dicit Croix id. tenendum, species non esse corruptas. If the consecrated species mixed with a liquor of divergent appearance are converted into wine similar in substance to that in which the consecration was made, the prior species remain. The consecrated ones: likewise not those subsequently added. HEAD II. ON THE CAUSES AND SUBJECT OF THE EUCHARIST.

DOUBT I. On Causes. "Here we discuss only the efficient cause, that is, the Minister, in whom what is required for valid consecration is found; this is evident both from the general statements about Sacraments, and from the previous question's doubt number 5." What is required for a lawful reception will be made clear in the following Doubt, concerning the subject receiving the Eucharist: because all dispositions which are necessary for worthy reception are also required for a licit consecration; since the one who effects it must necessarily receive beforehand. Here therefore is sought, 1. Who is to dispense the Eucharist?

What is required on the part of the Minister for a lawful dispensation? ARTICLE I. To whom should the dispensation of the Eucharist pertain? 250 May it alone be permitted to priests to minister the Eucharist? 251 Are only priests validly consecrating? 252 What is notable about priests consecrating simultaneously one Host, whether with a Bishop? 255 Must a parish priest minister the Eucharist during a time of plague? 254 Can an inferior priest incur irregularity by ministering? 255 Is the consent of the Pastor sufficient? 256 What if it should be necessary to minister in the Vatican? 257 Qu. I. When is it permissible for Deacons to minister?

Qu. When is it licit for a deacon to minister? May it be permitted to clerics or presumptuous laymen to receive the Eucharist themselves in necessity? Yes. III.

May a layperson minister to another in necessity the Vatican? Book II. Dub. I. On the causes of the subject of Enchâristiæ. 47 38 Can a priest outside the article of death administer communion to himself? 39 Can others besides pastors minister Eucharist in the article of death and at Paschate? 40 In which cases is it permissible for Regulars then to minister? Resp. To dispense the Eucharist ex officio can only do so the priest having ordinary jurisdiction, delegated or at least reasonably presumed, or a privilege.

The reason is because the proper function of pastors is to shepherd, which is primarily accomplished through the Sacraments: V. Bonac. d. 4 q. 1 p. 1. 2. It is certain by faith that only priests are validly consecrated to celebrate the Eucharist, as is evident from Tradition and the definitions of the Nicene Council c. 14. Lutheranist under Florence in and Tridentine sessio 23 canon 1. Moreover, from this make that Tridentine for my commemoration. By what words alone was the power of consecrating conferred by Christ upon the Apostles and their priestly successors: for it was fitting that ministers for such a ministry be consecrated in a singular manner. Here it must be noted that if several priests should consecrate one host at the same time, all would indeed effect the Sacrament, as is common according to Suarez, and in that place n. 5: moreover, they should have the intention of consecrating then only when they form the sacramental with the bishop at the same time: furthermore, beyond this, during the consecration of the chalice they intend not to consecrate anything if they happen not to have consecrated the bread themselves.

Since it is certain that only priests can consecrate; hence it is presumed with certainty that the ministry of the Eucharist pertains solely to them. 233. Here it is asked, whether the Parish Priest is bound to minister the Eucharist at a time of plague, even at risk to his own life? The first opinion very gravely affirms this, and those who hold it are 19: Concilium 1. 8 p. 40 n. 13. On the contrary, Thomas says: In question 32, quesion 3, where he states: The other opinion is more secure and more probable; therefore, in time of pestilence or some contagious disease, a parish priest should administer the Eucharist to his parishioners infected with pestilence or another infectious disease; this is presumptuous if done at risk to his own life, unless it be done by someone else, and unless certain circumstances occur which merit excuse. Reason, because although this Sacrament is not said to be necessary for remitting sins, it is nevertheless morally necessary for persevering in justice. Silvius however (afterwards) 1.

If some infirm persons were to die without Confession. If there is a serious danger for the priest, and if the future death will entail a great loss to the

people, it would be fitting that he himself alone do it, and another should not easily be held capable... The second opinion denies this, which those hold who say with Dic Gabr. at Diana p. 3 tr. 4 R. 174, with Major Villal., and the Ratio, because this Sacrament is not of such necessity that the priest is bound by that reason to risk his life in administering it. And this sentiment finds great probability from the Declaration of Gregory XIII found in Fagnan, tom. 3, in cap. Glericos de ubi refert, quod, instante Sancto Caroli Bapromaeo, an Parochi tenerentur ministrare Sacramenta tempore pestis? The aforementioned Pontiff having approved on the 13th day of October in the year 1576 the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, thus declared: A Parish Priest is to be held bound to minister only those two Sacraments necessary for salvation to his Parishioners laboring under pestilence, namely Baptism and the power to confer it either personally or through a substitute when suitable, so that the Parish Priest may hear Confessions of the healthy, because others might be deterred from doing so if they saw him approach the infected. Then Fagnanus reports, that the same Gregory, in Cap. II.

Dub. I. On the causes of the Eucharistic subject. April 28, 1576. The Archbishop of Florence, who had decreed that the parishes of his diocese minister the sacraments during the time of pestilence, is commanded by the same Sacred Congregation of the Council to have the parishes absolutely hold themselves ready only to minister (the sacraments of) Baptism and Penance. And thus in fact the Sacred Congregation responded, moreover adding the word per alios; for the Sacred Congregation said that this had been the mind of the Pontiff, namely to prohibit so that the Parishes not themselves, presumptuously desiring to do so, minister Baptism and Penance for the convenience of the Parishioners who were sound in health.

Fagnanus ita dixit: Deinde hic sedulo notandum, quod, cum circa idem tempus quaesitum fuerit, an Parochi temporis pestis tenerentur reside? The same applies to Fagnanus, loc. cit., what the Sacred Congregation decreed on December 6, 1576, namely that they be held bound; but this should not be established by a general law, but signified by Letters of the Sacred Congregation to the aforementioned Archbishop, so as not to compel all parish priests, but only some, dividing the work or appointing other priests; with enclosure. Arms. et . But, upon presentation of the report, the Pontiff decreed: To be simply written Letters to the Cardinal of S. Praesedis, by which it will be signified that His Holiness has decreed that parishes must absolutely remain in their churches during the time of pestilence, but they may nevertheless have the Sacrament of Baptism administered to adolescents by some other suitable person, and Penance; and if they do not comply, proceedings shall be taken against them,

observing the form of Session 23 of the Council of Trent. Finally, some Church Prelates doubted what is proper to the office of Bishops during a pestilence, namely, whether they are bound to reside in their parishes and presumptuously to administer the Sacraments to their Curates?

Refers the Pontiff die 18 dec. 1576 sic declared: Decretum factum in Parochis multò magis pro- cedere in Episcopis, qui magis obligati sunt; tamen posse Episcopos in locis tutioribus manere, et indè pro- videre. And this must be observed, that this Decree was proper to the Pontiff, by which the office of bishops in general was explained: for truly, if the bishop desert his sheep in such necessities, who will take care to provide sufficiently for them? He commits a mortal sin who dispenses the Eucharist without any jurisdiction. Bon, l. cit. p. 2. quia violat. "in the matter of another's jurisdiction."

Moreover, a lower cleric incurs in addition irregularity, as it is taught by Coninc.* (The same thing is taught). Stirrer of that title, cap. 5, note 3og. Mazzotta t. 3, p. 131, cum Bonac. et qui dicunt: Idem de Clerico ministrante Baptismum solemniter. Reason, because among these Sacraments only the Priest is the minister, and the Deacon ministers them only by commission; hence, a presumptuous Deacon who ministers these Sacraments without commission incurs irregularity, according to canon 1. » concerning the cleric ministering Baptism without ordination.

See what is said regarding the Doubt. Hereby Religious orders incur excommunication reserved to the Pope by presuming themselves, namely without permission of the Parochial priest, and specifically, to presume to give Extreme Unction, or Eucharist, or to solemnize Matrimony: unless they have a privilege, or the Parochial priest abstains, or unjustly refuses, in the article of death. However, the dicta excuse ignorance, the gross presumption, from excommunication, according to Præp., etc.; and this is noted on account of the word "praesumptum." 2. Hence Religious persons incur ipso facto excommunication reserved by the Pope, if they presumptuously, without permission of the Parochi, and specially, presume to give Extreme Unction, or Eucharist, or solemnize Matrimony: unless they have a privilege, or the Parochi absents himself, or unjustly refuses. Licitly ministers the Eucharist he who presumeth, the Pastor having been made by his approbation.

Reg. l. 29n. 91. Bonac. l.c. n. 7. (Palaus punct. 18 n. 4. dicit: ex consuetudine communiter præsumi consensus Parochi quoties Communio non fit ex obligatione. Hence rightly says 2 R. 1: when a common thing is conceded to which the faculty of celebrating is granted, it should also be understood that the faculty of ministering the Eucharist is granted. And

thus reverently everywhere the usage has been. However, he says that this presumption also has its place, when Communion is received out of devotion, not rather if it is received out of obligation: but that one is also admitted into the Paschal precept, if one presumptuously receives Communion. Cap. II.

Dub. I. Tamen hanc præsumptionem tan-tum locum habere, cum Communio fit ex devotione, non vero si ex obligatione: sed illam admittit etiam in præcepto Paschali, si præsump- Of the subjects of the Eucharist, 5i namely if it be rational, for instance if a person frequently communicates. Otherwise, see Croix n. 634. and Lugo d. 18 n. 51. > with .

Diana, and others rightly say, this assumption in Communion from obligation is not easily to be had: rather adds Croix, it is not altogether sufficient, which certainly the parish priest would have given permission if asked; for if he were recognized as Pastor, and at least confusedly knew his own sheep). 3. If an infirm person needs to be fortified with the Sacred Viaticum, and either the proper Pastor is absent or cannot bring forth the Eucharist himself due to lack of presence, any other Priest, whether regular or secular, can then administer this presumed Communion, because in that case it is presumed the will of the Bishop or the Pope. Here. 5 trans. 4 cap. 7. Bon. l. c. n. 10. Th.) * Dixi in gr. in magno festo, quo Sacerdos est occupatus confessionibus, concionibus, etc. 6 R.39. » from Præp.

In extremis vero necessitate, v.g., articulo mortis, si non esset alius, etiam diacono, òmò laico, licere secluso scandalo, et alios et seipsum communicare, probabile est ut contra Concilium . htc d. 2. n. 11. » It is confirmed by 1 R. 48. from Sed 9 1. 6 R. 39. yet in practice this is not easily done, on account of the contrary custom. Card. de Lugo. d. 18 lib. 2. Goodness. d. 4 qu. 5 p. 1.

Here is questioned I. When a deacon can minister the Eucharist. There is no doubt that a Deacon can minister the Eucharist in necessity, as is stated in Carthage. IV. Can. 39. where it says: Diæonus præsent Lib.

VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. To the presbyter, if necessity commands, I will exhort him to offer the Eucharist of Christ's charity to the people.

But it is doubted whether this necessity should be extreme? It is affirmed on page 452 with Habert, and with Habert, and Witass, saying that it is necessary to require the necessity of administering Viaticum when the Priest is absent; because otherwise scandal would not be avoided, since the

usage which formerly prevailed in the Church (as Alcnsis and Sotus testify) had ministered to the people, having become obsolete, which previously was strong in the Church (as Alcnsis and Sotus testify). But commonly denied is Suur. d. 72 s. 2 concl. 3. Lugo d. 18 n. 27. et cum qui dicunt, sufficere necessitatem gravem, nempe cum nullus adsit Sacerdos, qui commode possit ministrare. And to this the Council Fathers did not dissent, that sufficiency is adequate for that just cause.

Otherwise Sylv. v. Deacon says: The command of the Bishop or Parish Priest is sufficient even if no cause exists. And it is held that, when a Priest is absent, a Deacon may minister presumptuously without commission and even if there be no urgent necessity. But Father Suarez justly rejects these two opinions. All, however, agree that in extreme necessity, absent a Priest, the Deacon may and shall minister Viaticum, even without commission: thus Tollemachus 1. 3 c. 28 n. 2. et alii., citing Soto, Victorinus d. c. Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 489. et alii.

It is asked. Is it licit for Clerics or presumptuous Laics to receive the Eucharist by themselves in necessity? The first opinion denies this, and this view is held by Lugo on the 18th day, note 24, who calls it common; Gonet on the 10th day, note 18. With Palud, note 11. With Vasq. Soto holds that this sacrament is not necessary for salvation. Seconda vero sententia affirma.

Dub. The first. On the causes of the Eucharistic subject. 65 confirms what they hold. 72 sect. 1 at the end, Caj. in Matth. 26. Fill. tr. 4 n. 285. Escob. l. 6 n. 455.

Diuna p. 3 tr. 4 res. 47 et probabilem pu- rant Lugo d. 18 n. 23. et Ratio, quia in tali casu necessitatis, puta in articulo mor- tis, urget praeceptum divinum communicandi; è converso nullo praecepto divino; vel ecclesiastico id apparet prohibitum; imò notum est, quod olim fideles laici Eucharistiam in suas domos deferrent et seipsos propriis manibus communicarent: et hoc quidem propter necessitatem permittebatur; cur autem eàdem necessitate occurrente aliquando permitti non poterit? Then it is asked: Thirdly, whether a layman may administer Viaticum to a dying person in necessity. It denies [the proposition], in question 13, article 1, question 1, answer 3, where after having said that it is permissible for a layman to touch the body of Christ in necessity, such as when he extracts the Eucharist from an unclean place, it subjoins: But there is no analogy regarding the dispensation of the Sacrament, because the reception of this Sacrament is not out of necessity. And the same is held by Lugo, d. 18, n. 22. Petrorc. tom. 3 p. 448 q. 4 et 353. cum a S. Ign. et Hanno.

The reason is, firstly, because this would be contrary to the universal custom of the Church; secondly, because this Sacrament is not so necessary that, as previously stated, it must immediately follow; thirdly, because in canon 29 of Pervenit from Tournai law, only the case where a sick person cannot receive another Sacrament and doubts about perfect contrition is considered; for then the Eucharist becomes a Sacrament of necessity. They affirm however, at question 72, article 3, in the end, and Cajetan. They indeed affirm at 72, s. 3, ad finem, and Cajetanus. The reason strongly adheres and clings to the fact that no injury is done to the Sacrament if the Eucharist is administered by a layman to a dying person in such necessity. Neither does it hinder the lex- tus in cit c., because he is speaking of a priest who committed the ministration to an presumptuous layman outside the necessity of the case.

Neither does it hinder the contrary custom; for since this case will happen very rarely, the contrary custom can hardly be approved. This opinion is held by presumptuous Hubert in part 5, question 2, where he says that, given necessity, namely during a time of plague, it can properly be permitted to a presumed layman by the judgment of the Bishop to minister the Eucharist. "38 It is probable that outside the article of death, on account of grave cause, a Priest may be allowed to take hostia from the sacrarium and give it to himself, for example, if he has not received communion for a long time due to a prolonged illness, so as to avoid p. 31, c. 3, l. 6c. *(However, when, etc., n. 18, according to Sylvius, etc., say that the Priest can always communicate himself out of devotion, because, having been scandalously dismissed, there is no irreverence and nothing prohibited elsewhere unless another Priest be present: and he considers this not improbable thereupon he also adds that it may likewise be permitted to a Deacon, since the Nicene Council, Canon 14, grants this. Finally concludes that in this regard the current discipline must be regarded; I have spoken about a privilege which Religious Mendicants, and specifically the Society of Jesus, hold from Paul III. Bulla, et aliorum, ut scilicet in suis templis per se vel per alios Sacerdotes illic communicare possint quoscumque Christi fideles præterquam in mortis articulo (in quo tamen, si urget necessitas, praesumptum ratihabito Papæ invito Parocho ut habet Bonac. » Here), and on the Feast of Pasch. * (Except where a Bishop reasonably prohibits Communion to some individual), * V.

Card. de Lugo l. cit. s. 2 n. 38 et 49. But with regard to the feast of Easter, the Pontiffs here seem to understand and prohibit that communion which suffices for the annual reception of communion, as teach Ss, Filius, et Cmm. By the article of death is understood the time when either death stands proximately at hand and morally certain and inevitable, or when there is a danger of death, that is to say, Chapter II. Dub.: I. On the

subjects of the Eucharist. A probable doubt concerning the conservation of life in a case where death commonly occurs very frequently. Book 2, chapter 3, and third part, question 26, article 4, and others.

"From these words it is resolved that the regulars may licitly administer the Eucharist at the point of death, as well as in the following cases of Pasch." » 1. If the last things are necessary, that is, if there is danger to eternal salvation. 2. Si extrema sit necessitas, ut si periclitetur de salute aeterna. If there is a grave necessity, that is, a probable danger of death, and the parish priest does not wish to or cannot provide it, then according to Cardinal de Lugo, d. 18, s. 2, n. 53.

» (When they have privilege from a Pontiff or Bishop: which at this time Religious have in some places communion for giving Paschal. » 4. If anyone during Easter cannot communicate in his own parish, nor ask for forgiveness from the parish priest. 5. Si quis in Paschate non possit in sua Parochia communicare, nec petere veniam a Parocho. If on account of the reason of Paschal Communion the Parish has already satisfied itself, or is to satisfy itself afterwards, it is deemed to have done so, because then the Parish suffers no loss, since it itself [has done so].

» those who are able to abstain from communion at the paschal time. » (Id 72 s. 3 cum communi) Si contra Henr. et . et . gr. quod alias rationem communicantium habere in sua Parochia non possit; tunc enim ad Parochiam esse rejiciendos. Card. de Lugo d. 18 s. 2 n. 50. Bonaventura ibid. » (Refers N. SS. P. Ben.

XIV. The Sacred Congregation in its seventh book, chapter 42, declared that Regulars cannot administer the Eucharist to those who communicate out of devotion on Paschaltide. But Wigandt: if a sick person has not yet reached that state, so as to be bound by precept to receive communion from the common supply, even then he remains obligated to receive communion from the hand of the parish priest at the point of death. » 7. If the sick person has fulfilled the precept concerning viaticum with intention to fulfill that, because the administration of the Eucharist is only forbidden to Regulars when the precept of communion obligates.

Nevertheless, without license from the Bishop or Parochial Priest, it is permitted Religiosos to publicly bring the Eucharist through the marketplaces; for this would derogate by custom from the rights of the Parishes: hence, in such a case with permission from the Ordinary, privately administered, the Eucharist should be given in the Oratory of the sick or some other decent house place. Thus. Diana » 1. 4 p. 4 R. 14 et p. 9 t. 9 R. 63. » 8. Some, who frequently communicate with Religious persons,

are unable to receive in Parish; this is done by an implied and presupposed consent.

» He thinks that it can more easily be presumed in military presidium churches; likewise in court chapels, studious ones, and other academic institutions, etc., who frequently communing are accustomed to be outside suspicion. V. . c. 9. If during Paschaltide there are beggars, pilgrims, and those coming to visit, according to a probable opinion of many, as . l. 3 d. 37. Fagun. prae. 1. Erel. l.

Chapter 1, Article 8. Cardinal de Lugo, l. c. » To this objection are opposed Circ; and, most seriously, that they should receive the Paschal Communion in the hand of a parish priest, because it would then be more proper to their own pastor: But Busemb. very commonly teaches the opposite. disp. 2 3 n. 1 7. . d. 7 2 s. 2 infin. Lugo, disp. 1, cap. 8, n. 50 (quivocat ferem Communem). 4 a. r., 10. Anacl. p. 101 n. 40. . 10 n. 7. et. 8 n. 3 i. cum. Cajet. The reason why foreigners and vagabonds have their own Pastor; and it pleases the Reason of Eugenius IV: (according to « 10.

If they are servants, or domestics, or familiar friends. Give. I. On the subjects of the causes of the Eucharist. 57. - those who have such a privilege around them. V. - Compendium privilege.

Soc. v. Familiaris, and 1 - concerning doubts about the Regulars, R. 12 Bon..q. 7 p. 2 n. 19. - refers to a certain Declaration. S: C. Concilii (according to Sa) - as it was said, secular servants of Monasteries - to be received at the Paschal Communion in the Parish. But Bon. says that it should not be understood of those who dwell in Monasteries or in places exempt from Parochial care: and they agree with the common opinion, as he asserts, and Sakn.: c. 8 n. 30. when he says. But but they ought to be blessed.

Blessed. XIV. nam (ut ait praefatus Bened.) tantùm illi servientes Monasteriis sunt exemptià jurisdictione sui Ordinarii, qui, ut habetur in Undè, ut ait, non eximuntur ab obligatione Communionis Paschalis in Parochia familii Monasteriorum, nisi vivant intrà ipsam claustrum, et sub obedientia Prælatorum Regularium. Et huic conformi esse refert idem: Bened. plura Decr. S. C. et signanter illud editum 22 Nov. 1721, ubi dictum fuit: tenèri recipere Communionem in Parochia famulos Monialium degentes in domibus sitis in atriis Monasteriorum, muro circumvallatis, quae sunt contigua Monasteriis; cum janua, qua clauditur. But notwithstanding this, it is pertinent to Croix - 16. 6 p. 1 n. 635. The Society of Jesus was granted a privilege, by which domestic servants residing within religious enclosures may satisfy themselves with receiving

the Paschal Communion in the temples of the Society.

But P. Zacharia notes there that the Sacred Congregation has several times decreed that this privilege does not extend to other Religious Orders. ARTICULUS II. What is required in the Minister for the lawful administration of the Eucharist? Whether the Eucharist should be brought to the sick person vested with stole, superpelliceum, and light? What concerning the Extreme Unction? Is it permissible to run in necessity? Is it licit to convey Holy Communion on a horse?

And is it only permissible for her to touch it for adoration? Is it permissible to dispense with it or to celebrate with later fingers? And and in the midst of an instrument of time during a pestilence? When will there be a lapse in dispensing on account of the defect of the Rites of the Church? To whom is it not permitted to offer Communion? But should Communion be offered to kings with a condemned head? And and concerning half-wits, and those who are possessed? 248 How ought the Factor to guard the Eucharist? And whether the Eucharist should always be reserved and deferred with human beings? And whether Communion should be ministered at a Requiem Mass? What is to be done if the Host falls to the ground? What about the fragments of the Hosts? How often may the parish priest be bound to minister Communion? What is noteworthy concerning daily Communion? Resp. 1.

That the minister in the distribution of the Eucharist may not sin beyond grace, a presumptuous reverence be required of him both by reason and canons; so that this sacrament may be omitted (since its reception often is not necessary for salvation), rather than positive irreverence be admitted. Wherefore is it resolved. 1. The Eucharist should not be administered to the sick person unless with a becoming disposition, that is, in vestments and over a pallium, preceded by light: according to the manner of the Extreme Unction, whose matter, since it is not a Sacrament, does not require so much veneration. Chapter II.

Dub. I. On the causes of the subject of the Eucharist. 59 » (As presumed by Mazzarino with Croix, and commonly) *. They think */ however, that if it cannot be carried in a habit, or */ if there is a storm or need for travel, it would not be irreverence if the Priest should carry the Eucharist in a pyxide, or a corporal wrapped around his body in secret. That it seems to be more certainly permitted in heretical places, where, presuming necessity and clamorously, without a stole and overcoat, he may extend himself: although it should never be celebrated without sacred vestments on account of public giving. Bonaventurae, de quarto, quaestio quinta, paragrapha secunda.

To administer the Eucharist without light, and with the usual confession, is reckoned only as a venial sin, as the Third Commentary divides it, with Gregory and at the end with common assertion, as he asserts. But to minister without the stole and superpalliceo, the Doctors commonly hold to be mortal on account of their nature, as . The common doctors and those omitted nevertheless say only that the stole. Whether, however, in necessity it is licit to minister with Sylvester and Possessus, because (as he says) it is more fitting to preserve reverence for so great a Sacrament than to communicate without it. But more commonly and sufficiently probable affirm it Croix, and Mazz.

U. cc. Gobat. tr. 4 n. 417. et Renzius q. 15. Cum autem Eucharistiam deferre ad aliud altare sine vestibus sacris, dicit Croix l.c., cum Diana, et comm., non excedere peccatum veniale. He considers presumptuous that the Bishop may dispense, so that Viaticum be carried with a pileolus to villages and hamlets. « 2. It is preferable to die without Communion than to have a Priest go about in public attire with the Sacrament (although he should hasten very much; as Quint. 1. 4 s. 8 says). But it is probable that one can go about without irreverence in necessity, as Croix n. 614 says. with Gob. item contra: c. q n. 25. cum, et Poenitentia, si probabiliter timeretur; ine aegrotus decederet in mortali; tunc enim currendum esset, ut habet Bon. l. c. ex S. Th. Possessed and to others.

» 3. It is taught by Quint. o. 4 s. 8 that it is permissible for the priest to bring the Eucharist to a seriously ill person who is far away, on a well-behaved horse, so that there is no danger of falling; the same holds if there is a cause of storm, or distance, or because there is danger in delay. » And this S. Carolus allowed in the Acta.* But Possev. and [others] deny it, and add that a pyx is not to be given to be carried by a layman, even though the Pastor may be fatigued, but rather a burdonsome one is to be suspended from the neck. » 4. The Eucharist is not to be brought to an ill person or a venerable one merely as a cause for him to see it or kiss it if he cannot take it.

Which prohibition was also made by the Congregation of Cardinals: although this does not seem to prohibit that it be deferred for a cause of veneration to a lion if it is celebrated in a house. * (In this absolutely attention must be given to the Church.) The Sacred Congregation of the Council, in section thirteen, canon seven (ap.). Lugo Responsio. Mor. l. 1 d. 11 n. 3; ubi ita declaratum fuit: Non licet S. Eucharistia ad aegrotantes deferri, qui morbi gravitate impediti sumere eam non possunt, sed venerationis gratia solent eam deosculari. And, if by chance such a custom exists in some place.

"Thus it is entirely to be abolished, which Pius V prohibited.*" 5. It is not permissible to give the Eucharist with other fingers, if the index and thumb cannot be used according to the chiragrum; as Bonaventure teaches in his Decretum, 5 q. 4 p. 2, and Possevinus; against Toletan, whose opinion seems safe, if another should die without viaticum: especially if then death were imminent for two indices. Question: Whether one who suffers from chilblain can receive the digits of others? Cap. II. Doubt. I.

Of what subject? Eucharistiae. 61; is, quem pollice et indicem ministrae Eucharistiam? They affirm, along with Croix l. 6 p. 1 a. 4go., together with Ariaga, Leand, and Gob, that although only the first digit of the Priest is anointed, nevertheless the whole hand is consecrated. They more probingly deny it. Renzi c. 3 q; 16 et Bonac. d. 4 p. 2 n. 10 cum Posseo: Ratio, quia, etsi tota manus sit consecrata tamen index et pollex ex ritu Ecclesiæ ad hoc ministerium deputantur.

And although they admit it to be communicated with Bus. Diana et Renzi c. 9 n. 26. et posse ministrari Eucharistiam posterioribus digitis in casu extremæ vel Gravissimæ necessitatis: Pariter tamen communiter dicunt Pol. tr. 29 d. 6p. 11 n. 3. al. tr. 5 e. 7 n. 6. Bon. eod. tit. d. 7 q. 2 c. 2 n. 16. cum . Sayro, Avila, Fill. et Reg., quod si quis haberet pollicem ita infirmum ut non posset cum eo hostiam frangere, non posset celebrare. This is inferred from the book of Ulpian concerning the general rule; it is something that constitutes an impediment to receiving the Order, but after reception of the Order, does not hinder its exercise; see 9 ar. 4 n. 15 and Mazz. in the same title, chapter 5 n. 1: deposed priest, who had an incompetent indicium for use... » 6.

It is not permitted to offer the Eucharist at a time of plague through some intermediary means (much less to place it anywhere in a dish so that it might be taken by oneself from there), but it should be handed with the hand, as Bonaventure teaches in the fourth distinction, question five, article two. Although nevertheless, they deny 3 R. 50 and Renzi c. 3 q. 16. with Fugund. et Concilio Mediol. V. where that vice was. But they reasonably think it not improbably licit in such necessity also, and according to Gavant. 5 dub. 6. * (See the discussion n. 288. v. They say): *. » 7.

A priest suffering from gout may be carried to the altar that he may there administer the Eucharist; yet otherwise restrained by another prohibition. Thus » Resp. 2. It is likewise required that she dispense it according to the customary rite of the Church; then, that she refuse (inherently speaking) it to those who are indisposed either in mind or body: finally, if she be a

Pastor, that she minister it to her sheep whenever they reasonably request it. Bonaventurae, de quarto, quaestio quinta, paragrapha prima, numerus quindecim. I spoke about the rite of the Church; because the legitimate order of the Church is bound by sin. Wherefore the resolution follows.

» The sin of one who gives the Eucharist under either species, in places, or to persons, to which it has not been conceded by the Pontiff. Moreover, if a moribund person who is unable to approach the host because of the dilation of his tongue cannot take it, he may receive the species of wine * (as they commonly say when etc., because the Viaticum command does not oblige when it cannot be received in due manner, and according to the Church's rite) *, although such a one might attempt to excuse himself from mortal sin c. II. He who dispenses without sacred vestment, or stole, or prior general confession formula. *(See no. 241.)* III. He who gives a larger portion of the host to a layman; yet in necessity, or in the case of great devotion, may nevertheless give from a larger part broken off * (If it is done without cause, it is not licit, but it does not exceed venial sin, as rightly he says when Poss.). It suffices for that excuse if the one to be communicated with is an invalid, a nobleman, a servant, or another person who cannot easily be excluded without inconvenience, and even if he receives communion solely out of devotion, as commonly stated by the same author in loco citato and also according to Saint Anthony, and subsequently minor parts (not, however, so small that they could not be given decently) are divided and distributed.

Ita Sa v. Euch. d. 4 q. 5 p. 1 n. 14. I have said two. It is negated per se: because it will cooperate with another sin. However, it can often happen per accidens, v.

gr. si sine scandalum, aut gravissimo damno suo, vel penitentiæ, negare non possit. See c. 5 n. 8. Wherefore it is resolved. » 1. Fault 1. He who gives to children before the age of discretion (unless at the point of death) who perhaps begins around the age of ten. *(See below note 301.)* 2.

He who gives alimentations, when never are they used reason-wise. If however they have been used, it is possible and fitting that they be given at the point of death to them, if it can be done without risk of irreverence, and it does not appear that they fell into madness in a state of mortal sin, * (See to be said further. *) n. 301. Qu. II.)* 3.

Whoever gives to a public sinner—e.g., to an actor in disgraceful comedies with mortally grave representations, a usurer, a prostitute, or a concubinage partner; about whom see and follow—(See what was said) n. 46. I have said Public: because if you only privately know that he is

indisposed, even privately, yet not publicly, it must be denied to one who asks privately: unless the indisposition is known from confession; for then not even outside of it may one advise, as teaches l. 5 t. 4 c. 6. Card. de Lugo d. VIII de Sacr. s. XI n. 189. * (Vide n. 49 et 50.) * 2. Penance also is due who denies that a person should be scourged for his death, (by which some can be presumed to have been given, even up to one hour before death, as Sa[tursday] holds: it should rather be given if possible, not in prison or any other dishonorable place) by presumption on account of a crime committed while captured, provided that they suffer the penalty: even though they deny the crime and a violent suspicion persists. But rightly affirms that it is more commendable to dispose by Penitence and Judgment according to P. et Juanin p. 272. Conclusion 3, according to the usage in Italy and Germany (as in France and Spain); and a presumption that it may be given before death, if necessity demands, as Concina admits: for the Council of Nicaea, canon 13, prescribes that the Eucharist is to be given to all who come to the way of exit.

He rightly does it who rarely, for instance at Easter, gives communion to semifools and those who have a weak use of reason; if indeed they distinguish this food from the profane even slightly, as Henry and Posse hold. The same may be said almost in regard to the deaf and mute from birth. See. He who gives to those possessed by demons, provided that they can take it without irreverence. Thus * (See to be said no. 303.) * I have said three. If a Pastor be. Thus resolved. « 1.

Such a sin gravely against justice and charity if a pastor does not provide to subjects in danger of death, although infected with pestilence. Another priest, however, who in such a case, either absent or unwilling on the part of the parish priest, would refuse to give [the sacrament], would sin only against charity, even according to Chapeauville mortaliter. q. 37 n. 2. Chapter II. Dub. 1. On the causes and subject of the Eucharist. 65 » 2. Pastor, ut Eucharistiam opportunè petentibus possit ministrare, tenetur eam asservare cum lumine in Ecclesia; nec licet alibi, ne in sacellis quidem nobilium, vel choro monialium, aut inter septa Monasterii earum, ut habet de reform.

c. 10. (nisi cum facultate in solemni festo) in pyxide; quae non necessariò est consecrata, licet si consecrata non sit, debeat interiùs vestiri vitia lineà ex tela consecrata, ut ex S. Regin. in praxi to. 2. lib. 29. c. 9. If on account of gravely culpable negligence of the Pastor, or of him to whom this care has been committed, during an entire day; or during several complete nights, the light does not burn before the venerable Sacrament, it teaches that he has sinned mortally (according to whether it is only for one hour), and S. 1. et 7. item also allows Marchant. » In respect to the obligation and

custom both universal, it denies: as regards the light: preferring when the Sacrament is brought forth, and from the cause that this can be omitted, so that when it is judged for a distant sick person who is far away, nor can it conveniently be done without light. (Vide dicta hic n. 241. v.) To minister). Various matters sought and diverse, and useful for practice here are 49 to be resolved.

Seek. I. In the Mass for the Dead can Communion be given? These three things present difficulties. Doubt. 1.

Is it permissible to minister communion within the Mass? Gavantus denies part. 2, 6, p. 1, n. 492, ex Decr. The Sacred Congregation of Rites issued on the day 22nd of January 1701. But they affirm justly Fourth p. 2 tit. 10 n. 6 and Meroti. ibid. in conjunction with Gastaldus, and with many others. Prob. ex 22. c. 6. ubi dicitur: Optaret sacrosancta Synodus ut in singulis Missis fideles ad stantes Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent.

Note in each Mass: Therefore presumptuously in the Masses for the Dead. Item because in the Canon also of the Mass for the Dead it is said: That whatsoever shall have partaken of this altar's participation of the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son, etc. Then likewise below there. Let it not be noted; for then even outside of it not even is permitted, as it is taught in lib. 5, tit. 4, cap. 6. » Card. de Lugo d. 8 de Sacr. s. 11 n. 189. * (Vide » n. 49 et 50.) » 2. Paccat item, qui negat reis morte plectendis, (quibus praesumptum potest dari aliquot, imò unà horà antè mortem, ut habet S. Augustine: danda verò est, si fieri potest, non in carcere, vel alio loco inhonesto) praesumptum ob crimen sagarium captis, dummodo pœnitentiam præseferant: etiamsi crimen negent, et violenta duret suspicio, 4. * (Negat Contenson d. 4 c. 1 spec. 3, posse dari Communionem capite damnatis, nisi diù priùs pœnitentià sua crimina expiaverint.

But rightly does he affirm that it is more laudable to dispose by means of Confession, as stated by P. and Juañín, p. 272. Conclusion 3, ut usus habeat in Italia et Germania (secundum in Gallia et Hispania); et praesumptum ubi ante mortem si necessitas urgeat, ut admittit Concina; ex Concilio Niceno Canonis 13 praescribitur quod Eucharistia danda sit omnibus qui ad vitæ exitum veniunt). He rightly does so who rarely, for instance at Easter, gives communion to semifools and to those who have but a weak use of reason, if they scarcely distinguish this food from what is profane, as do Henry and Poissy. The same may be said almost in regard to the deaf and the mute from birth. Vide. He who gives to those possessed by demons, provided that they can take it without irreverence.

Thus * (See to be said no. 303.) * I have said three. If a Pastor be. Thus the

resolution. " 1. Such a sin gravely against justice and charity, if he does not provide for subjects in danger of death, although infected with pestilence. Another priest, however, who in such a case, absent or unwilling on the part of the parish priest, would refuse to give [the sacrament], would sin only against charity, even according to Chapeauvil. mortaliter. q. 37 n. 2. Chapter II. Dub.

I. On the causes and subject of the Eucharist. 65 § 2. Pastor, ut Eucharistiam opportunè petentibus possit ministrare, tenetur eam asservare cum lumine in Ecclesia; nec licet alibi, ne in sacellis quidem nobilium, vel choro monialium, aut inter septa Monasterii earum, ut habet de reform. c. 10. (nisi cum facultate in solemni festo) in pyxide; quae non necessariò est consecrata, licet si consecrata non sit, debeat interiùs vestiri vittà lineà ex tela consecrata, ut ex S. Regin. in praxi to. 2. lib. 29. c. 9. If on account of the gravely culpable negligence of the Pastor or of him to whom this care has been committed, during an entire day; or even several complete nights, the light does not burn before the venerable Sacrament, it teaches that he has sinned mortally (according to whether it is only for one hour) and S. 1. et 7. also allow this, even if Marchant permits it.

» In respect to the obligation and custom both universal, it denies: as well with regard to the light being preferred when the Sacrament is carried forth, that this may be omitted on account of which it cannot conveniently be done when the Sacrament is carried to a sick person far distant. » (See what is said here n. 241. v. Ministrare). Various matters sought and diverse, useful for practice here are 49 resolved. Seek. I.

In the Mass for the Dead can Communion be given? These three things present difficulties. Doubt. 1. Is it licit to minister Communion within Mass? Gavanus denies it in part 2, chapter 6, page 1, note 492, according to the decree.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites issued on the day 22nd of January 1701. But they affirm justly in the Fourth, p. 2, tit. 10, n. 6, and Merati. Ibid. In the same place with Gastaldus, and many others. Prob. ex 22. c. 6. ubi dicitur: Optaret sacrosancta Synodus ut in singulis Missis fideles ad stantes Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent. Note in each Mass: Therefore also in Masses for the Dead. Moreover, because in the Canon itself of the Mass for the Dead it is said: "That whosoever shall partake of this altar's participation shall receive the most holy Body and Blood of Thy most dear Son," thereafter below, after the fifth Communion of the celebrant, there shall be said: "If any are to be communicated, let them be communicated before He be purified."

It is said that Merati had these words inserted into the Missal for the Dead during the time of Urban VIII, who prescribed this among other things: That in the Mass of Requiem, if one wishes to do so, no blessing should be imparted. Nor does it hinder the Decree opposed man. 1 7 0 1. For Merati also asserts in his Annotationes in Directorium Ecclesiae Genuensis, 1715, that although the Decree opposed it, namely An. 1701 à S. C., the Communion was not forbidden to be given in the Masses for the Dead. C. Because of new heretical motives, it has been prohibited outside the duplicate copy of the aforementioned Decree. Then the Author refers to the fact that on February 22, 1711, this same S. C. had proposed this very question.

C. it was deemed that, the aforementioned Decree should have been suspended in the year 1701. Hinc odè et ubique vigetus Communiónem dispensandi intrà Missam de Requiem; imò hodiè certum est licere ex Decretó modo x referendo. Dubium. 2. Is it licit to give Communion in particles from precursors consecrated for the Mass of the Dead, or in another Mass? They affirm P.

Merati. n. 3 oet Bened. XIV de Sacrf. Missat. 9 l. 3 c. 1 8. saying that the opinion of those who hold that something more is not to be admitted as found newly invented, since all authorities and rubrics rather than from such a limitation make the word. It matters not that the pre-consecrated Particles do not look to the same Sacrifice; for the whole fruit of the Sacrament being perceived as sufficient, the faithful from the same victim by participation shall take part. The Supposititium, however, is certainly regarded as erroneous in some Decretum to the contrary, which refers to certain Kalendario anni 1736.

He himself is said to have used diligence and taken pains in arranging the registers S. R. C., concerning which whether he was able to come at all that Decree. But notwithstanding these, die two. September 1, seven four one, new has come forth Decretum. S.C.R. in Aquensi, quod dictum fuit; In Missis Defunctorum seu... in paramentis nigris celebrantur, non ministratur Eucharistia per modum Sacramenti, scilicet cum Particulis præconsecratis, extra hendo Pyxidem à Custodia.

However, it can be ministered through Chapter II. Dub. Chapter I. On the causes and subject of the Eucharist. 67 manner of the Sacrifice, insofar as it is, when faithful ones are provided with Communion with the Particles consecrated beneath the same Mass. Here it is noted that on the previous day, June 21, 1670, another Decree was issued, namely: Funereal Masses cannot be celebrated unless they are in black vestments, or at least Funereal Masses cannot be celebrated unless they are in black vestments,

or at least in violet. Given this, it is stated that only the Eucharist may not be administered with black vestments, and otherwise allowed, so that a Requiem Mass may be celebrated in violet vestments. It is stated that it is licit to administer the Eucharist with pre-consecrated particles in Funereal Masses which are celebrated in violet vestments. And furthermore, it is permitted to administer the Eucharist both before and after Mass.

Doubt. 3. Can Communion be administered by the celebrant before or after the Funeral Mass? Merati denies this, arguing that Communion is never to be distributed in black vestments outside of Mass, as prescribed by the Roman Rite, so that the priest should wear a stole of a color appropriate to the Office of that day, or at least of white color, as Merati himself and many Doctors maintain. What was presumptuously approved by St. Charles on page 1. However, it is certain from the Ritual.

Romanus, intra Missas vivorum, populi Communio statim post Sacerdotis sumptionem fieri debere, nisi justa causa suadeat fieri ante vel post Missam; ut si plurimi interest et suspicio esset quod aliqui eorum Missae longioris tædio caperentur, ut docet N. P. Bened. XIV. on Sacrifice 3 chapter 18. Question. II. What is to be done in a case where the host becomes spoiled? First, according to the Rubrics, it is covered with a clean linen cloth and then washed; yet these do not oblige under grave penalty, as Pasq. notes at Croix, l. 6, p. 1, n. 404.

Pelliz. If the host falls upon the breasts of a woman, the priest himself should not remove it; but the woman herself should take it away with her hand and place it in [the container]. Question. III. What is to be done with the fragments of the Host? In the rubric of the Missal (definition), it is thus stated: If after reception of the Body and Blood, or after the consecration of what has been received, the priest should discover any remaining fragments left behind, let him take them, whether they be small or large, because they pertain to the same Sacrifice.

And this is not only immediately after Mass, as is common according to Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 496, but also if the priest has reserved the species of the Host in the sacristy, still nevertheless vested with sacred vestments, as they say there. Gobat. XIV. concerning the Sacrifice. Masses I. III. c. XVII. n. 5 and 6 against Lugo d. 15 n. 82. They say that this can happen: ibid., even if those fragments are remnants of another Sacrifice, because (as they argue) all Masses are considered one kind of Sacrifice; and this opinion is deemed probable by Hæc; but Cajus commonly denies this.

Sylv. l. c. n. 81. ac (roix n. 497. cum Suar et Tann. nisi adsit periculum irreverentiæ, alias non licebit, tum quia ex rubrica, ut suprà, sacerdos non

potest sumere reliquias post ablutionem, nisi eas tantùn quæ ad idem sacrificium spectant; tum quia sumptio reliquiarum alterius sacrificii non pertinet ad illius perfectionem, congruent sumptio reliquiarum ejusdem sacrificii. It is said, bring in vested; for if the Priest has already put on sacred vestments, then the aforementioned blessing will be applied. XIV. l. c. cum Clero Patavino, reliquias vel reponendis in tabernaculo si adsit, vel reservandis alteri Sacerdoti celebraturo eodem mane; alioquin ab eodem qui celebravit esse sumendas. Here, however, it must be noted that if a priest should fail to receive Communion from the sick in the hospital, and there remain relics in the paten or chalice, the priest may take them, provided he is still clothed in sacred vestments, as Pul. says in Benè verè Cap. II. Dub.

I. Hic autem advertendum r quod si Sacerdos defe- rat Communionem infirmo in valetudinarius, et rema- neant reliquiae in patena vel calice, poterit Sacerdos eas sumere, si adhuc sit sacris indutus vestibus, ut ajunt Pul. . Benè verè Cap. II. Dub. On the causes and subject of the Eucharist. 69 can it be presumed that they give rise immediately after the particle itself is handed over, because then it is considered morally one Communion, as rightly taught by Tamburg and Lugo d. 15 n. 80, who testifies to such a practice, so that after Communion the pyxis is washed, and the ablution itself is given. Moreover, what is added to the aforementioned heading number 3 should be noted. If the host received by the server be found entire and consecrated, let him place it in the tabernacle... if this cannot be done, then to the following priest... may he leave it to be consumed... if it is not possible to do so decently in a sinuadrum, let him himself consume it in the very chalice... but if there be no way to honorably conserve it, he may take and eat it himself. Particulae autem inventae extra corporale, in dubio, an sint consecrata, sumendi sunt praesumptum post ablutionem, ut dicunt Bon.

Henry et Quære. IV. Of what hour may permission be given for communion. Response is given: In and of itself, any hour of the day can be dispensed with, because there is no prohibition regarding this; thus commonly they teach both cum ac and cum Syb. Yes, Tab.

Az. I possess. Henry and 8th section 4 at the end, where St. Ambrose is quoted as saying, it was customary to celebrate and to give Communion around the close of the day in its own time. We have said, speaking per se; for as all the aforementioned authorities state, it is not permissible to administer the Eucharist at night or during the evening (that is, in the last part of the day) both on account of scandal and because of the contemporary custom of the Church; against 6 p. 1 n. 493: who said that indeed it would be fitting for Communion to be administered frequently;

but to allow it presumptuously during the evening is permitted only. This is cited with Concilium I, Canon Comm: si §. 1 n. 5. with S. Augustine, and if some special cause should intervene: this seems probable if it was during the evening; for it would be untimely at night to presume and not permit Communion in the Mass of Matins. Lord, it is said to be midnight, according to Beer.

S. C. R. approbat. Bened. XIV. t. 9 l. 3 c. 18 neither on Preparation Day according to his Decree. S. C. die 19 Et licet hoc Decretum in Registris non reperiri testetur Merati, tamen S. C. Concilium die 12 XIV. l. c. mandat ordinariis ut circ dictionem Communionis in feria sexta in Parasceve Missalis Rubrice et Ecclesiae Romanae usus servetur. From which our Pontiff rightly infers that Communion should be denied on that day both because it is stated in the Missal rubric for the Fifth Week of Easter, and because I ought to reserve certain particles for the sick; thus the healthy are excluded; furthermore, because according to Roman custom Holy Communion is not distributed on Wednesday of Holy Week.

On the day of the holy Sabbath there is no Decree prohibiting Communion; but Marcus in the Ecclesiastical Vocabulary says: In the Mass of the holy Sabbath that antiphon which is called Communio is not said, because the people's Communion was not being celebrated then, which would now indeed be to be performed. Haec tamen ratio non suadet; nam perdoctus P. Merati p. 4 tit. 10 n. 56: cum Gran- colas, Moretto, et aliis satis probat, quod olim in Missa Sabbati sancti omnes communicarent, non so- lume parvuli, sed praesumptum reliqui fideles, ut patere dicte ex quodam antiquo Ordine Romano, ubi legitur inter caetera: Omnes communicent. He adds with Gar., Grancolas, and Durando that today Communion and Poste are omitted not for any other reason than because the Vespers suffice in their place, which should rather be called an action of thanksgiving than the Office of Vespers. We therefore do not have a place where Communion is forbidden on such a day; hence he says: indeed it is known that in many Churches of the Kingdom and of the City of Naples, and especially in its Cathedral, Communion is ministered to the people after the solemn Mass. 333 Question NoneV.

Is the parish priest bound to minister the Eucharist to his flock? Some have said that the parish priest is bound only by the time of the precept, and at the point of death. Thus Sib. and Rich. But commonly these are rejected by the Chapter II. Dub.

I. On the causes and subject of the Eucharist. 71 others, who teach that it is to be ministered whenever rational sheep reasonably and opportunely request it. Thus it is agreed with Soto and others according to Ratio,

because it falls to the Pastor to provide not only that the sheep fulfill precepts, but also presumptuously that they have what greatly profits their own advantage. Question NoneVI.

What is to be understood about the use of daily 254 Communion? Indeed, some have spoken improperly when they said that daily Communion should be recommended to all who are in grace, nay rather, should even be commanded. For although St. Augustine said: Receive daily, that thereby it may profit you daily. He nevertheless adds: So live, that you may worthily merit to receive it daily." Hence says St. 10. It is required that with great devotion and reverence... approach it... but since many impediments to this devotion occur frequently in most men... it is not advantageous for all men to approach this Sacrament daily.

Wherefore deservedly she was damned by Innocent. XI. prop. 56. quae dicebat: Frequens confessio et communio tamen in his qui gentiliter vivunt est nota praedi-sintentionis. They spoke more appropriately, for it is a sign of reprobation. Others too rigorously understand quotidian or frequent Communion to be turned away from it, if they lack that very extraordinary purity and fervor. For it was condemned Propos. 23. by that which says: Similar things to sacred Communion are to be avoided, in which as yet there is no pure love of God and no absence of all mistrust.

Nor is it wonderful if some ancient Master spoke with severity on this matter, for such severity prevailed at that time through the use of the age, which today does not prevail. Therefore, this point ought diligently to be attended to according to the Decretum of the Sacred Congregation issued in the year 1679 and approved by Pope Innocent. XI. Extensively refers to Croix n. 65, where among other things it is said that the frequent use, or daily use of the Eucharist has always been approved by the SS. Fathers, but, by reason of the diversity of consciences, nothing de ipso constitui posse. Then it is pronounced thus: The frequent access to (the Eucharist at) the confessional... should be left to judgment, which proceeds from the purity of conscience, and the fruit of frequency, and towards piety for lay negotiators and spouses, that they may look forward to its profiting their salvation.

Hereafter is added: In this therefore the diligence of Pastors shall chiefly watch, not that frequent or daily... the taking of something might be deterred from the unique Precept formulated, or that days for general receiving might be constituted; but rather more that each thing may be permitted to singles by himself, or that a Confessor be assigned to him by the Parochus (he speaks of the Bishop): And let this also be provided entirely, that no one who has frequently or daily approached the sacred

Conventicle, may be repelled. Finally, it is concluded: Bishops, where such devotion (that is, the frequent use of Communion) flourishes, they should render thanks to God for it and, using their prudence and judgment temperately, should foster it. As regards this Pontifical Decree, note that it is prescribed therein that Bishops—and even less Parochial priests—although they may be able to tax Communions individually to some of their flocks, nevertheless minimally cannot generally prescribe Communion for all days. They must altogether provide, that no one be repelled from frequent or daily Communion, whose use they themselves are bound to foster according to the rules of prudence. It is likewise prescribed there, that such frequent or daily use of Communion (supposed for merchants and married persons) be left to the discretion of the confessors, who according to the purity of conscience and the effect of Communion shall prescribe. Hence it must be said that the confessor, especially deriving from the fruit of frequency and from the desire of the penitent, should take as a rule either to augment or diminish the use of Communion.

See what we shall more fully discuss at the end of this volume on this point. Practice of Confessors, § last. Nam et qui dispensat Eucharistiam ex peccato mortali, peccat mortaliter? See no. 35, where we have embraced the affirmed judgment. QUESTION II.

ON THE SUBJECT, OR THE RECEIVER OF THE EUCHARIST. ARTICLE I. What disposition is required in the soul regarding this? On the precept of confessing before receiving Communion. I. Whether this precept be divine or ecclesiastical? 257 Qu.

II. Whether he who after Confession remembers a mortal sin is bound to confess that same sin again before Communion? Who. III. Is it permissible to be abased? What if the Priest doubts about a committed sin?

Remit-sive ad n. 471. de Sacram. Penit. 259 Non excusat a Confessione celebritas, devotio, aut paupertas. 260 Excusat vero unus. Peril of death, and necessity for administering Viaticum. 2. Scandalum, aut nota infamia. What if the Viaticum is deferred to a person who cannot so quickly make Confession? 261 What if the people, or even the Priest himself should lack the Mass, or Paschal Communion? 262 What if the Priest commits a grave sin while celebrating, or remembers a past sin, and must he confess if he can?

See ibid., doubt 1. And whether one is bound to desist from celebrating Mass, if one cannot confess? V. dub. 2. 263 Quod si laicus recordetur habere peccatum mortale in scanno communi- cantium? 264 Quando

censeatur deesse esse copia Confessarii? And what distances excuse the Confessor? What if there is present neither a simple Priest nor a Confessor excommunicated? 265 Qu.

I. What if the Priest should have a reserved sin, and there be lacking a Confessor possessing the faculty? What. II. Whether reserved or unreserved mortal sins are to be confessed to you?

What. III. What, if he has a reserved excommunication? 266 Qu. IV. How is to be understood the precept of confessing as soon as possible?

What. How is the precept of confessing to be understood as soon as possible to be understood? Is it held that the Priest is bound by this in the case of a sacrilege? 267 Qu. VI. Does the celebrant, having confessed and having forgotten the sin?

VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist. Qu.

VII. A priest who has not confessed, who remembers a sin after consecration? 268 Qu. VIII. An preceptum confitendi quamprimum obliget praesumptum laicos? 269 Effectus Eucharistiae. 270 Quaer. I.

Is it a new venial sin to approach the Eucharist with a venial habitual sin? Qu. II. He who communicates with a venial actual sin commits a venially, and loses the fruit? 255 «) * Thus where those teaching the contrary are in fact excommunicated. It is grounded in that, 1. to Filluc. and others commonly hold.

» (Let them be associated, or else they render the very evil choice virtually) do not place an obstacle to the sanctifying grace. Now if many [things] are such, and within their own kind grave matters, concerning which no penitence is conceived, they impede actual devotion and a greater fruit. . and others. » Quaer. I. Is this precept, which precedes Confession and Communion, divine or ecclesiastical?

In the 13th chapter, section 7 thus it is found: Especially since those words full of dread are read among the Apostles: He who eats and drinks unworthily brings upon himself judgment, not discerning the Body of the Lord; wherefore the commandment to be recalled before one wishes to communicate is that he prove himself: Ecclesiastical custom declares it necessary for this proof, so that no mortal conscious of any sin against his conscience may communicate without the preceding Chapter II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. The sacramental confession should

proceed to the sacrament of the Eucharist. Upon these words, others, namely B. 12, 2., say that the precept of Confession is merely ecclesiastical, and this they infer from those words: "What is given to him who wishes to communicate must be recalled in memory (namely, of the Apostle) as a precept."

Therefore, the Council did not recognize that precept as being from Christ, but rather from the Apostle. Nevertheless, common and true sentiment is held by Svar. d. 66 sect. 3 c. n. 3. Lugduni d. 14 ex n. 69. c. 7 n. 25. cum aliis docet, hoc praeceptum esse divinum. Reason, because on one side it is constituted that this proof should be pressed from the precept of Christ, since the Apostle testifies that he received that from the Lord; on another side, from the same Council it clearly appears that this required proof is a Confession; for although that precept may be referred to the Apostolate, as Lugdunensis more readily understands it; yet the Council did not say that this precept of Confession was introduced into ecclesiastical custom by the Church, but rather declared such a precept to be from the Church; hence the Confession is commanded from the divine precept. Neither does it hinder that this is called an Apostolic precept, because it is truly a precept of Christ promulgated through the Apostle.

Quaer. II. If anyone after Confession remembers a peccatum mortale inculpabiliter forgotten, should he confess that again before Communion? Est casus, quando per dolorem universalem peccatum iam est indirecte remissum. The first sentiment among the commonest decrees affirms this, and the Lucca doctors hold thus according to d. 14 n. 126. . 66 sect. 3.

Nat. 2 § 1. Diana page 9 treatise 3 response 4. Cross n. 539 et Sess.: 13 c. 7. ex verbis illis supra relatis: Ut nullus sibi conscius mortalis peccati, quantumvis sibi contritus videatur, absque praemissa sacramentale Confessione ad sacram Eucharistiam accedere debeat. Therefore, he who is conscious of a forgotten sin before Communion ought to confess that precept before Communion. The more so, since such a precept is thus explained by the practice of the universal Church.

They nevertheless commonly accept it, as Bonaventure says in loco citato n. 18, namely, when etc., and also Victor ca-sums it, if without danger of scandal or infamy one cannot confess, for example, if he celebrates or is already in the seat of the communicants from which he cannot withdraw without notice. Here, however, one must diligently attend to what Bon. says in his Decretum, dist. 4, q. 6, p. 1, n. 19, namely that scandal is said to be given when there is an occasion for detracting or rashly judging, not when there is merely an occasion for admiration. The second science denies this, and thus Garcia holds in Diff. 5, dub. 5, part. 5, n. 5o. Preface,

q. 8, art. 5, dub. 3, n. 14 (who, even if speaking speculatively, defends it as having been brought forth), Hieronymus Ferrantinus thinks that Cornéjo and Reginald hold it to be probable; according to the aforementioned location: ibid., and with sharp criticism they defend it most recently as learned: q. 2 with Arringa, Cibert, and Pontas; saying that the first opinion is not supported by any reason for probability. I know that Diana, who, although she inclines most often to the more favorable opinion in matters of choice, and does not rarely deviate more than is proper, yet, forgetting at present her benignity, calls this second opinion entirely improbable, and refers it according to the command of the Inquisition of Spain as having been expurgated from the works of the Father completely consonant with reason.

Reason, because he who preceded Communion with Confession has already fulfilled the precept of Confession; by whose means the sin is now indirectly remitted, and the penitent is already proven to be justified. Even so, it is held that said sin should be confessed with the keys before death, or at least that the precept of Confession is established by Trent that one should confess immediately before Communion. You will say: In the Council it is commanded that one who is conscious of sin should not communicate in the sacrament unless preceded by confession, even though he may be contrite; therefore whoever remembers a sin forgiven before communion ought necessarily to confess that. But it is replied that in the Tridentine Council there is prescribed only that the penitent approach Communion justified not merely through contrition, but presumed through Confession; whereas he who has already been presumed justified through Confession is therefore not bound to confess again immediately before Communion. The practice of the faithful, which is opposed to this, is not to be regarded as a certain rule of obligation, but rather as a pious and commendable usage, which I most strongly advise as presumptuous, albeit with circumstances dispensed; nevertheless, my most illustrious and learned Master F.

Julius Tornus, et alius Theologus Examiner Systemalis in Urbe Neapoli in re moralis valde versatus, cum aliis doctis Recentioribus a me consultis, mihi affirmarunt hanc secundam sententiam esse valde probabilarem. Question. III. Whether a penitent of such sort, who in Confession remembers a mortal sin culpably forgotten and who either is unwilling or does not wish to confess according to the recently altered judgment in the preceding question, should be held before Communion to elicit an act of contrition? Medina affirms at Lugo d. 14 n. 121. and Dianu p. 2 tr. 14 R. 48., this opinion is presumed Reg. . But it is said in l. 30. de Euch.

Prob. 56. nequaquam se invenerunt loca, ubi AA. praefati hanc sententiam

docuerint. Others however, as Lugo n. 122. Holzrn. l. 1 p. 350 n. 69. et cum Sylvio, et Quarti, primam sententiam communiter rejiciunt; hac quidem nixi ratione, quia homini integre justificato (ut suppo- nitur) sufficit justificatio sua; nec ullum apparet fundamentum, unde, et ad quid haec contrito requi- ratur: non ex praecepto, quia hoc nullibi invenitur praescriptum; non ad delendum peccatum, quia hoc jam delectum est per confessionem antea factam. 258 « 1. He who doubts whether he has committed a mortal sin, or whether it has been rightly confessed as mortal, is bound to confess before communion. Ita Bon. d. 4q. 6 p. 1 ex . et aliis. (Sed vide dicenda de Sacramento Paenitentio n. 471.) 259 2.

I said unless there is necessity (not any kind whatsoever, e.g., festal celebration, or great devotion, as some wish) (And thus Armilla feels; but the opposite must be held with Busemb. and with .) Congruent neque paupertatis Sacerdotis celebraturi excusat nisi esset valde gravis, ut ait Croix n. 535; sed gravis sive urgens, qualis esse censetur in sequentibus casibus, praemissa tamen semper contritione; ad quam tunc teneris, nisi de peccato quod occurrit fueris ante contritus. Section 14, Article 6, Note 122. 1. Peril of death, so that the host may be consecrated for the one who is about to die. From Lugdunum, day 4, section 5, number 107. (And from Etienne and Antoine, page 485.) 2.

If the Sacrifice, or Communion cannot be omitted without grave infamy, or scandal. The same [author] (When c. Modò Confes- [a confessio is absent]; or when a confession cannot be completed due to temporal straitness, as . 1.). » which, if one is sick in imminent peril of death, then the Confessor shall hear graver sins and absolve him, imposing upon him the obligation to complete the confession if he recovers; but if such peril does not exist, then Tourn. thinks that the Priest should endeavor to elicit contrition from the sick person, and give Communion, if Communion cannot be omitted without infamy. But better is the counsel and Sporer thereof. Title n. 446. (And it is thought probable) that then the Confession may be partly made, under the same obligation to complete it if he recovers.) 3.

If the parish priest is to celebrate ex officio, so that the sacred people may hear it, ibid. (Nor should a superior be present who celebrates, as Palaus rightly notes, n. 7.) Antoine loc. cit. - Et non possit Parochus omitere celebrationem sine infamia*. Ob quam causam praesumptum est - alteri, qui non est Parochus, id licere putat - cum aliis 11, p. 9. t. 3 R. 9. contra Palau m, Aversam, etc.* (Qui verius contradicunt cum n. 53. Lugo d. 14 n. 11. et Roncag. qu. 3. quia popu- lus Sacrum non audiendo, tunc minimè peccaret) *. - 4. If the precept concerning Communion should be urgent, as Henry teaches and the procurator considers probable, or if the priest cannot hear Mass unless he celebrates it himself, although the latter seems

to be taught by the probable opinion, nevertheless it appears that the contrary is being taught by the canons. When, however, the scandal and infamy cease, then to abstain from the Sacred Communion and Paschal presumption is to intermit what these precepts do not oblige when they cannot be fulfilled suitably according to divine law. (As regards hearing Mass, it is held that a priest can licitly celebrate when Sylvester and Palud hold so, and Lugo and Fill are probable in this regard; yet Tournai more strongly contradicts them, p. 502.)

Lugo d. 14 n. 115. Conc. p. 345 n. 26. cum et Bon. quia praeferendum est praeceptum divinum ecclesiastico. As regards communion, however, with Sot. Palud. - et alii de Lugo n. 116. cum Conc. Henry and the common opinion assert that it is possible to have Communion without Confession; but Tournay and those who agree with Suarez and Reginald deny this, because the annual precept of Communion does not obligate when it cannot be fulfilled in due form. Both opinions are probable.) * 5.

If after consecration a priest commits a mortal sin, or remembers one before its commission, he is bound to proceed with the Sacrifice in an act of elicited contrition; but if this occurs before consecration, and especially before the Canon, he should confess, if without note of infamy it can be done, or receive, as Sylv. and others against Soto and Hering. hold, who do not consider themselves bound by reason of the honor of the Sacrifice; they think that practically it is probable that confession with due note cannot decently be made without some note. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

» could it; unless perhaps in a solemn Mass, under chant, or discourse: in which case it will be held to be confessed, as Sylvius notes. » If however it is unable to elicit contrition, according to common opinion it would be necessary either to confess or to desist: although 17. And Hurt. de Euch. d. 8. consider it probable, namely, that one would not commit a mortal sin, if he could not withdraw without noting; understand, if an effort has been made to withdraw, or if he has withdrawn, as much as he was able. V. Card.

from Lugo, part 9, section 2, note 8, where he teaches the same. He notes however, "It is sufficient if one believes in good faith that he is contrite," although he doubts. Here the doubt is i. A Priest who, while celebrating, remembers a mortal sin, is bound to precede the consecration and especially before the Canon interrupt the Mass, summoning the confessional, that he may confess if possible without stain? They deny that it is necessary according to tract. 4 R. 77., and they say that it suffices if the confession is made, because the precept preceding Confession seems to

be understood as before the inchoation of Communion; for it does not become a Sacrifice to be interrupted after it has been begun.

But they distinguish more finely with Bus. Suarez says in section 4 of treatise 67. Lugo d. 14 n. 113. cum c. 7 n. 50. cum Conink. et aliis multis, et dicunt, quod si Sacerdos recordetur peccati post consecrationem, tunc Missa non sit interrumpenda, ut docet etiam D. 83 art. 6 ad 2. et expressum habetur in Si verò recordetur antè consecrationem, et præsertim antè Caionem, tunc debet confiteri, si possit; quia cum talis pars sit extrinseca Sacrificio, benè potest Missa interrumpi ob hanc rationabilem causam, utì fieri solet etiam ob concionem, vel oblationes populi. There is a doubt 2. An Sacerdos in hoc casu ante consecrationem, si nequeat confiteri, tenetur etiam Missam deserere?

They deny it, c. 4 sect., where citing S. C. 25 n. 76, he says that a priest, having noticed a sin after the beginning of Mass, should not cease from celebrating even if it could be done without scandal, Reason, because Chapter II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. That earlier part is not about the substance of the Sacrifice; yet it is connected to the Sacrifice by reason of the manner of one sacred action; and thus, after it has been initiated, it should be completed. But Lugo affirms the probable in his d. 14 n. 113. and v.

Others, when it says that this opinion is safer. This is confirmed by the Rubrica (3 p. tit. 8 n. 4 et 5), where it is thus stated: If before consecration a Priest remembers that he is in mortal sin... or that he is excommunicated, or suspended, or that there is an interdicted place... if scandal is not feared, he should abandon the Mass begun. I said it is probable, not certain; for it is not certain that the Rubrica imposes a grave precept under this heading. Moreover, Tourn rightly observes that in such a case, almost the infamy of notoriety will be hard to avoid. "6. If in the seat of communicants you remember 263 a mortal sin, which you have forgotten to confess, neither can you recede without note or cause great scandal, as it is stated.

Reg. Card. de Lugo l.c. n. 12 et alii* (Cum Salm. n. 47. et communis. See what is said in n. 258.) To confess the Eucharist to one who is giving it, does not suit nor befits, so that in that case, even if you cannot yourself elicit contrition, it excuses from sin. Hurt. l. e. » (Thus you confer to be confuted, see what has been said in this book, chapter 6, number 33.) * Rather some Doctors among those found by Henry excuse the laic before the confessed, presumptuously cutting short the note and causing scandal; not receding from it, because he is said to be justified and approved through confession. He approves that sentiment, Tambur.

» in exped. com. c. 1 §. 8, potestque servire scrupulis. V. Regin. lib. 29 n. 105. Bon. d. 4 p. 10 ») * » I have spoken 3. And there is lacking a Confessor; but let it be wanting, not as some wish, if he is absent who usually is present, and one would desire to confess, or to whom one would desire to make confession for beneficial or useful reasons: nor even though Religious cannot in the school confess grave sins, when some infamy of Religion is involved.

Friend, » 1. If no one is present, you cannot go to someone absent without great difficulty (considering both debility, age, and personal affairs, as well as other circumstances, such as weather, and brevity of time). Good. l. cit n. 3o. ex c. 7 n. 32. cum Excusare etidm distantiam Confessarii causd itineris duarum horarum, dicit Gobat. cum Marchantio; Rhodes unam leu cam idest tria miliaria; Canus autem ait sufficere iter quinque quadrantium; ità apud Croix n. 334. qui rectè ait cum Aversa, et Dic. hoc judicandum ex circumstantiis; undè ait 2. Si non existit, nisi ignarus idiomi, vel carens jurisdictione, vel excommunicatus, vel non approbatus, vel cui non possis confiteri sine gravi damno tuo vel alieno, velsi habeas peccatum tantum reservatum, nec pateat aditus ad superiorem; vel superior semel iterumque per pium Confessarium rogatus negaverit potestatem absolvendi. ex R. 15. si absque gravi nota prætermittere non possis.

Thus Sylvius and others. Nevertheless, contrition and the purpose of confessing are required even in these cases; nay rather, from the precept, it does not seem that the precept is to be extended to Laics or Priests communicating only, so as to the contrary. It teaches Third Question, Sixth Part, First Article. Here it is necessary to extract more questions. Inquire.

I. 265 When one has a reserved sin and does not have access to a confessor with the faculty of confession, should he be bound to confess to a lower authority so as to be able to receive communion? If this person has no other mortal sin except the reserved sin, the command is not to force him to confession, but merely sufficient that it be brought to an end; thus Lugo on Euch. d. 14 n. 87. infn. Bonaventura, idem, tractatus de unitate Dei, lib. 1, cap. 4, sectio 3, quaestio 80, articulus 5, cum Palud. Arm. et Adria. ac cum Con. Reg. et cc. cum quod, si in aliquo casu Sacerdos advertens se non habere contritionem sed solam attritum, teneatur confiteri venialia quae habet vel mortale aliam confessum, ut sic à reservato saltem indirectè absolvatur et in statu gratiae communicet; (et hoc probabilius est juxta sententiam mox dicendum). Quod docet Lugo n. 103., quod hoc poterit semper facere, etiamsi habeat contritionem ut secutius Eucharistiam recipiat. But what if he has at once reserved mortal sins and non-reserved,

the first opinion denies that he is to be referred to Confession, and says that this one can be communicated provided only the aforementioned contrition; thus on page 499, section 5, number 9.

Herein also 2. article Gerson. and seq., and also Armill. Preface, q. 4, art. 7, n. 6, et justly calls this probable. 66 s. 4, § Quartus: Reason, because that Confession would be invalid before the inferior, since it would be made by a judge incompetent to do so; who, on account of reserved sins with which the penitent is burdened, lacks all power over them; hence, absolution cannot suitably be divided to remit one sin without another; thus neither can Confession. The second opinion, however, is more probable and most common, which the Sisters hold according to Concilium, tom. 8, pag. 348, n. 32. Lugo n. 87. who calls it common, and Sal. d. n. 36. when concurring with. Reg. Ratio, quia, cum urgeat præceptum divinum præmitendi Confessionem Communioni, debet fieri Confessio saltem formaliter integra, si non possit fieri integra materialiter.

Question NoneII. Hereby, by preceding the Confession, one is bound to confess both reserved mortal sins and non-reserved sins. VI. Treatise.

III. Is the Eucharist? empty? The first proposition affirms, and this is held by Suarez in his second book. However, none of the aforementioned authors provide a reason for this proposition; but it seems that this could be assigned to it, namely, because the confessor ought to recognize the entire conscience of the penitent, so as to form a proper judgment whether he is capable of absolution or not, perhaps because he is a recidivist in reserved cases. The second opinion, however, is no less favorable towards Babylon, nay rather more probable, denies this to be reserved for Confession; and this opinion is held by 102, namely Gerson, 14 n. 86, who considers it probable with the Major.

Peter. Soto, S. Ant. Ratio, nam etiam hic reservata peccata bis tenere debent confiteri, primo inferiori, dein superiori; nam et quia, ut supra dictum est, nullam videtur obligationem habere confitendi peccata illa super quibus Confessarius non potest esse judex, cum nullam super eis habeat jurisdictionem. I said by itself, and I do not doubt it, that such a penitent at times, for instance (as we have said), if tricidivus in reserved matters, or on an occasion proximate to recidivating, should be held presumptuous to open the reserved matter inferiorly, so that the confessor might rightly judge of his disposition; but this would indeed be by chance, not by itself, nor either from the obligation of the integrity of confession, since in such a case formal integrity suffices. Question. III.

What if a penitent has a reserved excommunication? Others, as Sotus,

Sylvest. Covar. et d. i4. n 99. dicunt, hunc extra mortis articulum numquam posse communicare. But commonly they contradict 4 d. 31 sect. 3 ii. 6. and Conin. d. 8 n. 107., and rightly consent, that he well can receive the Eucharist, urgently causing scandal, or notable infamy. Reason, because the Church's precept prohibiting excommunicated individuals from receiving the Sacraments is not obliged when a concurrent natural precept seeks to avoid scandal, or when it is inconveniently borne with regard to infamy.

But there remains a doubt, whether an excommunicated person can then confess, not having the authority of Chapter II. Doubt remains whether an excommunicated person can then confess without having Chapter II. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 85 faculty over excommunication? The first sense denies this, and this Vasquez holds, as well as Soto, Suarez, and Cano, and they consider it probable according to number 38 and 3 R. 104 with Palud.

S. and Megala: This they say can indeed communicate, having first shown contrition, although he may have other unreserved mortal sins; yet they cannot confess, since he is excommunicated, which prevents them from receiving the Sacrament of Penance. This is probable; but more probable is the second sentiment affirming this, which Lugo holds on day 102, chapter 8 number 5. With Ang and Recte also approving it. Lugo, et . cc., valide posse aliquem a peccato absolvi, non praemissa absolutione a censura: Ratio, ut bene ait. Tantummodo igitur excommunicatus invalidè recipere should sacramentum poenitentiae valde possit, in quantum prohibitiuncia ecclesice, accedere indispositus; sed cum urget necessitas haec bene ipsum eximit tunc a probatione ecclesice unde tunc et legitime et validè suscipiat poenitentiam. Question.

IV. How this precept 266 from session 13 chapter 7 is to be understood: No one conscious of a mortal sin, even though he may appear contrite, should approach the sacred Eucharist without having previously made sacramental confession; and this the holy Synod decreed that it should always be observed by all Christians, except those priests who have been entrusted with the duty of celebrating, so long as there does not lack them a confessor. And si necessitate urgente, sacerdos absque praevisa confessione celebraverit, primo confiteatur. It was condemned however by proposition 38, which stated: The mandate of Trent given to the priest sacrificing out of necessity with the intention of confessing a mortal sin as soon as possible is counsel, not a precept. Given therefore this precept of the Council, there is doubt as to how that "quamprimùm" is to be understood?

Surely was it condemned by the same Alex VII. proposition 3g., where it was said: That particle "quamprimùm" is understood when the priest will confess at his own time. Others however, as 3 Res 24 says should be understood, namely when such a Priest first celebrates: But this opinion is altogether improbable, as Escob. de Crolx. says in lib. 6 p. 1 n. 545, and Diana ibid., because then he would be held by the reason of his own celebration to confess immediately, but Tridentine law, precisely through its celebration, imposes the precept of confessing at first. But others, on the contrary, hold that it is to be understood immediately upon the cessation of necessity, and that the priest conveniently may proceed to confession even on the same day of the celebration; thus Wigandt in tract. 11 n. 3g., and Sancius in loco, uphold this opinion as the more secure. But better does P. Milante with the common doctors, as he says, in his dictionary proposition 3g. Lugo d. 14 n. 163. c. cum Gratia, Coninch. et Candido, cum Zerola, prop. n. 5. cum qui affert de hoc S. C. Declarationem, dicunt sufficere, ut Sacerdos intrà triduum confiteatur: Pariter ac in c. Eos qui de Sentent. Anathema in sexto praecipitur, ut ii qui in articulo mortis absolvuntur a excommunicatione reservata, teneantur cum convaluerint se presentare superiori quam quod commodè poterunt alias reincidunt in eamdem censuram et hoc non obstante ut ajunt Lugo Milante et Garcia non judicantur reincidere si intrà triduum se presentant.

Thus also 2 c. 10 n. 55. with Ugolino and Sayro says, to gravely violate the precept of referring heretical books to inquisitors is not to release them for two days. Cap. H. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. The intrinsic reason seems to me this: since this precept is merely ecclesiastical (as it well proves . 66 s. 6.), the Church is not deemed to wish to oblige anyone to it with such strictness; Hence, what must first be understood morally, as it is understood in other human laws, namely in the law of final judgment and the law of final things.

C. de Felin. Commonly however Lugo says n. 162 and 163. . 6. Milante, et Diana ll. cc. cum Garcia, et Candidio, quod aliquando per accidens ex tali praecepto sacerdos ille teneretur confiteri eadem die, et forte eadem hora, puta si tunc confessarium haberet, quo postea per plures dies carebit, vel si cras eadem necessitas urgeret celebrandi, nec posset confiteri. Quaer. V.

Whether a confessor is bound to confess immediately a priest who has celebrated sacrilegiously, whether he does not have necessity, or whether although standing in necessity he nevertheless has abundance of confessors? Sylvius and others affirm at Croix n. 546. But most commonly and more truly they deny it. Sixth section, seventh chapter. Lugo d. 14 n. 150. Diana page 9, treatise 2, question 26, with Gran.

Seyr., Gob. c. et quasi communis sententia ut testatur Moya q. 6 § 4. Reason, because the Tridentine precept is ordered to instill fear in those who, under pretense of necessity, defer Confession but do not sacrilegiously celebrate Mass; whereas for those to whom this precept would very rarely be profitable—namely, those who, despite disregard for divine commandment, dare to celebrate in sin knowingly—they will more easily despise the ecclesiastical precept. It is well taught by Lugo, Resp. mor., l. 4, dub. 47, n. 5, that in positive precepts the argument from lesser to greater does not hold, when the lesser is not contained in the greater, as is the case in our instance, where the precepts are disparate. However, Lugo rightly notes D. 14 n. 150 that if such a priest, out of necessity and omitting contrition, should celebrate, he would nonetheless be bound to confess as soon as possible, because the Tridentine precept requires it. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. It is very little to distinguish between a priest possessing contrition or not possessing it; but it speaks of any priest necessarily as celebrant. This I think should be understood (whatever Croix says at loc. cit.) merely of him who did not have the abundance of Confession before the celebration; for if he had, the first case would arise in which that would truly be sacrilege and celebrated without necessity. Question NoneVI.

Whether he is bound to confess as much as possible him who celebrates after Confession in which he has innocently forgotten some mortal sin? Resp. Si meminerit post celebrationem, utique non tenetur, ut recte docent 2. et Marc. But this is probably admitted by Bon: Avers., et Leand., ibid., and even if in Mass after communion he remembers a mortal sin. In the Mass after communion, a mortal sin will be remembered; because truly he would not have celebrated with consciousness of sin, as the Council of Trent says. If, however, he remembered before the celebration but after confession, they say that at that time he was held to have fulfilled the precept of confessing as much as possible. c. and many others in the same place according to Croix l.c. But Croix reasonably considers the opposite opinion probable, because here it cannot truly be said that he celebrated with consciousness of sin without prior confession.

See all that is said in no. 258. Question NoneVII. A Priest, who after consecration remembers a sin, is hindered from confessing all that is required by Confession, and hence bound to confess as much as possible? They affirm in Mega, etc., according to 14 n. 140.

Reason, because then truly occurred the case in which there presses the Tridentine precept; for then the Priest already celebrates with consciousness of sin in necessity, and without confession. But they deny it

at [page] 144 and 126, and Lugo considers it rightly probable. Because in n. 3 it is said that the Priest who before Mass remembers the sin and celebrates out of necessity not having the opportunity to confess, should afterwards confess when he first can; but regarding this, speaking according to Ruhr, n. 4, Cap. II. Dub. II.

On the subject of the Eucharist. 89 he says: It is broken with the intention of confessing it, without what is added with the first. It is asked VIII. Is the aforementioned precept of confessing fully, as defined by the Council of Trent, binding upon presumptuous laity? The first opinion affirms this, and this is held by the Navarrese at Lugo on the 14th day, note 138. Concilium, pagina 341, nota 13, et continuatione.

Henry and Saunders. Because, as they say, the same reasoning applies to laics as it does in priests, for where the same reasoning holds, the disposition of the law proceeds in the same way. The second common and sufficiently probable opinion denies it, and those hold it: section 66, chapter 7, and Lucca number 139, who assert the common opposition of regici, Wigandt ir. 12, note 32, A. 5. Whoever asserts the common [opposition], in proposition 13. Ebel p. 95 n. 105. with Candido, Aversa, and Diana, Escob l. 20 n. 92 with Bon. Fill. etc., according to Concilium loco citato Ratio; nam et quia predicta regula ex paritate rationis currit in correlativis, æquiparatis vel connexis, non tamen ita hic; tanto magis quia sumus in odiosis, secundum dicta in Tractatus de Legibus loco citato l. 2 n. 200 v.

It is asked. Then because the reason differs for Priests and Laymen. For priests, in general, who frequently receive Communion more often than laity, it is easier to encounter necessity for receiving Communion without Confession; hence, priests easily omit Confession under the pretext of this necessity. And this is confirmed by the authority of Wigandt from Saint Thomas, who says: in that person to whom there is a lack of the sufficiency of Confession, and where there is a pressing common necessity, it is required to propose the intention of confessing and satisfying, adding nothing about an obligation immediately thereafter to confess. From which they rightly infer that, as they say, if a priest in necessity without Confession should communicate like a layman, he would not be bound to confess immediately; but rather (they add), if he were obliged to complete a sacrifice begun by another: or if he performed the office on Friday, because although then he would not properly say Mass, it would nevertheless be simply celebrated, as Rubr speaks.

Mass. from that day. go Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

Here finally it refers to note what are the effects of the Eucharist. The principal effect is to confer an increase of grace, as stated by the Councils of Florence and Tridentine, session 13, chapter 2. And sometimes by accident confer the first grace, not knowing oneself to be in a mortal sin, or believing oneself to have contrition, he adds to Communion with merely attributive participation, and from being contrite becomes truly contrite. I S. q. 79 a. 3. de cum Scotus et ferè communis (contra vide dicta in hoc l. 6 n. 6. Effectus II.

It is the Eucharist that remits venial sins, as it is taught in Session 13, Chapter 2, where it is said that this Sacrament is an antidote by which we are freed from daily faults and by which we are preserved from mortal sins. And they say with St. Thomas in the fourth article: For this opinion. Doctor thus says: Namque effectually the Sacrament is charity, not only as regards the habit, but also as regards the act, which is excited in this Sacrament by means of which venial sins are remitted. Wherefore better says Tourn. p. 629, this Sacrament does not immediately, but only mediately through the act of charity remit venial sins. Effect III is to preserve from mortal sins by means of the sacramental grace that is excited, devotion is strengthened, temptations are more firmly resisted, demons are driven away, etc., as St. Cyril teaches. But they assert that the Eucharist confers divine grace. Chapter II.

Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 91 presumptuously external protection, by which God does not permit that man should be involved in occasions in which He foresaw him to fall. Effectus IV. est remittendi poenam temporalem debitam pro peccatis; hoc autem non directe, sed indirecte ratione actuum charitatis, qui per Sacramentum excitantur, ut do cet S. cap. 6 n. 3 i et Effectus V. est actualis dulcedo spiritualis, qui effectus est quidem infallibilis, si non impeditur ex parte subjecti: consistit autem haec suavitas in promptitudinem voluntatis ad res divinas hilari animo peragendas. The effect sixth is a special union with Christ and His members, according to John 6.

In me manet, et ego in illo: Effectus VII. est adeptio gloriae; Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum. It has for some other supposed effect towards the body in this Sacrament, as Lugo holds, namely diminishing the fuel of concupiscence, exciting good imaginations, sanctifying the very body, and assigning resurrection and glory to the body. It is indeed very probable that the consecrated species, so long as they are in the stomach, cause greater graces, with a greater disposition approaching, according to Croix n. 524. with Con. Val. Question NoneI.

Is it a new venial sin to approach the Eucharist with a habitual venial sin?

They affirm. 4 c. 6 n. 3: and c. 7 n. 20. However, they probably deny it, Sotus, n. 21. Reason, firstly because this is more a deficiency of perfect reverence than positive irreverence; secondly because the very will to receive the Eucharist and its effect is some kind of virtual detestation of the vihicles, whereby the guilt is removed so that they themselves minimally impede the fruit of the Sacrament. It is asked II.

He who communicates with an actual venial sin will sin venially and will lose the fruit of the Sacrament? When guilt affects the very Communion itself, as when one communicates for vain glory or some other venial end, no one doubts that a presumptuous venial sin is committed, as they say as if it were certain and true. It is doubtful whether one commits a venial sin by communicating with an actual or virtual affection of venial sinning, or by means of a concomitant venial fault, for instance through voluntary distraction, or by uttering idle words, and similar actions? They deny it. Yes, on page 6, note 522, and they consider it probable that decree 66, section 1, verse.

To be said is this: Lugo, d. 14, n. 31, and Reg. ac Croix, loco citato, cum dist. 2, qui dicit: Nam habentem adhuc voluntatem peccandi, grevari magis dico perceptione Eucharistiae, quàm purificari. Reason; because such a communicant imposes a positive injury upon the Sacrament. Regarding the guilt: as for the fruit or effect of the Sacrament, others say that an acceding person without actual disposition (which consists in the exclusion of venial fault in the act of communion, and in some pious movement of devotion), shall receive no fruit of the Sacrament; and thus St. Thomas holds in IV d. 12 q. 2 art. 10 q. 3 Prenotandum; likewise St. Bonaventure. St. Anthony. Alenus. et Affirmant.

They prove that, moreover, from St. Augustine. Sermon 15 on the Word. Apost. ubi: Non justificat (Deus) non quasi dormientes, non quasi ut non conemur, non quasi ut non velimus. Translation:

Apost.: He does not justify (God) not as if asleep, not so that we are not blamed, not so that we do not will it. He desired to create thee without thee; He justifieth not thee without thee. Then on account of experience, it is observed that many priests celebrate daily in a state of grace, and yet nothing profit. But others more commonly say, such a one not to be deprived of any fruit, as in section 3 of chapter 63. Gonet disp. 8 art. 3. et Lugo d. 14 n. 36. cum Sylvio, Sotn, Vasq.

Thomas mulaverit sententiam in III p. q. 79 ar. 8, ubi expressè docet, quod licet qui communicat cum veniali concomitante Communione, v.g. cum voluntaria dis- tractione; non recipiat actualem refectionem spiritualem.

Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. May this sweet taste nevertheless receive an increase of habitual grace or charity. This opinion is indeed much more common, but it does not seem to be entirely unreasonable as a first one. ## ARTICULUS II. ## What disposition of the body is required? 371 Does pollution and conjugal act impede from Communion? 372 Qu.

I. What if the pollution had been voluntary? And what if it is a voluntary pollution? II. Is it always a venial sin to approach the Eucharist after conjugal intercourse? 274 Qu.

III. Does a husband who has fulfilled his debt owe it to abstain from communion on that day? And does an external stain, like leprosy, etc., prevent one from receiving communion and from participating in the celebration? Is a woman during her menstrual period? An latio armorum? 276 Whether a priest communicant should be dressed in liturgical vestments outside Mass? 277 Natural fasting as a prerequisite to Communion. See Resolutions among Bus. prænot.

In hoc non est de præcepto divino. Prænot. 2 does not admit a smallness of matter therein. Prænot. 3, three things are to be sought in order to resolve this fast, according to three Rules, viz. Rule 279 from the First Rule. That the thing is taken from without. Dub. 1.

Does a voluntary transgression in regard to the remains of food break the fast? Dub. 2. Do mixed drops of water with saliva, or tasted drops of juice, count? Is sugar inserted into the mouth before midnightr? An water drawn from a fallen person into a river?

Is blood drawn from a finger? What if it should flow forth from the head? Rule II. 280. That it may be taken according to the mode of eating or drinking. Dub. 1. Does dust from the snuff taken through the nose break the fast?

Dub. 2. Is smoke from tobacco? Dub. 3. Are leaves of tobacco and/or aromatic substances ground with teeth? Rule III, 281. That which has the reason of food may be taken, or rather.

Hence it is asked whether the consumption of capillary tangles, wool, wood, paper, pebbles, lime, and similar things satisfies the fast? Whether it is licit to follow the last interval between meals? And what if someone swallows food after the first stroke? Whether, in a case of doubt regarding the dissolution of the fast, it is permissible to communicate? See here, and read 1 n. 80. 94 Lib. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. Is it a sin to take food, or to expel it immediately after Communion? In which castes may one communicate non-judgingly who is not fasting? Is it permissible to give Viaticum again to the sick one who is not fasting? Dub. 1. How much time should one Communion be separated from another?

Dub. 2. Whether one who has communed with but a few on account of devotion, should be bound to receive Viaticum when danger of death approaches? Dub. 3. Whether one who has frequently received Communion should be bound to receive Viaticum upon the coming of mortal danger? Dub. 4.

Can a Priest sometimes omit the words: Accipe Viaticum etc.? Can a Priest celebrate without fasting in order to give Viaticum to another? Is it permissible to communicate oneself after a meal, so that the Eucharist does not perish or be treated improperly? An ad vitandum scandalum? 288 An ad perficiendum Sacrificium vel Communionem? 289 An ad vitandum mortem? Is it permissible to communicate before sleep or digestion? "1."

R 1. No corporal stain per se impedits the reception of the Eucharist, since it does but little regarding moral goodness or evil; yet it can sometimes incidentally impede due to subsequent effects. Thus it is communicated. Wherefore it is resolved. 1.

Non impedit pollutio involuntaria, imò nec voluntaria per pœnitentiam expiata, nisi effectum malignum, v.g., turpem recordationem ac delectionem, vel distractionem et perturbationem animi relinquat: eo enim casu, ubi et semper post culpabilem, praestat accendendum sententiam communem sub veniali debet differri, nisi alia de causa justa sua deficiat, v.g., magnus fructus fessitudinis, regula Ordinis: vel si à Deamone excitata putuit ad Communionis frequentiam impediendam. . 9 de Matr. d. 13. Bonaventurae, de quarto, quaestio sexta, numquam secunda. Cardinal de Lugo, treatise 15, section 1. 2. Neither does conjugal act prevent, although it may be fitting and seem advisable to abstain at least the night immediately preceding, if he rarely communicates.

Thus Fül, and L. Sancth. >c. Escob. lib. 7 E. 6 n. 83. Understand that if he repaid what was demanded of him out of necessity, neither any perturbation of mind nor any affection for things present did he suffer: but if he had done it for the sake of pleasure, it teaches Regin. l. 29 t. 117. . 5 t. 4 c. 6 n. 10 et 16 that on that day he should abstain (especially if a harmful effect had followed). March. Perez. d. 49 sect. 3 n. 8 añadiendo,

ser solo venial; de modo que la indecencia puede resarcirse por una justa causa.

» (See what is said here » n. 273. regarding » 3. Similarly, although it is seemly and advisable to abstain from intercourse on that day by reason of Communion, nevertheless it is less harmful for a good end; e.g., out of love for offspring, to avoid the danger of incontinence or to fulfill a debt. Ex 9 d. 13 et March. You will ask I. Does a pollution always impede from Communion? This must be distinguished between voluntary pollution and involuntary pollution.

If it was voluntary, Navar. and others say at ex n. 1 (where it is noted that in the posterior edition Navar. have changed their opinion), Habert t. 5, page 571, verso. But, Nat. 2 § 2 n. 11. 367 n. 18. and others similarly. However (whatever may be said about such a penitent who is at most to abstain from Communion on that day out of reverence for so sacred a sacrament). Thus Lugo l.c. n. 4 (who calls the opposite opinion false), c. 7 n. 59. 4 a. 8 n. 3. ex D. Thoma in IV D. 6 qu. 1 a. 4 qu. 2 ad 2 qui docet: Non esse consulendum alicui, quod statim post peccatum mortale etiam contritus et confessus ad Eucharistiam accederet, sed deberet, nisi magna necessitas urgeret, per aliquod tempus propter reverentiam abstinere. And it is evident from chapter Testamentum 1.

If he shall have celebrated [the Mass] without previous confession, as much let him confess. She was condemned however from proposition 38, which said: The Tridentine mandate made to the priest offering sacrifice out of necessity with a view to confessing a mortal sin, is counsel, not a precept. Therefore, given this Council's precept, there is doubt as to how that "quamplimùm" is to be understood? Surely was it condemned by the same Alex VII. proposition 39, where it was said: That particle "quamplimùm" is understood when the priest confesses his mortal sin at that time. Others however, as 3 Res 24 says, understand it to mean when such a Priest first celebrates: But this opinion is entirely improbable, as Escob. de Croix. l. 6 p. 1 n. 545 and Diana l. c. say, because then he would be held by the very reason of his celebration to confess; but Tridentine, precisely defined in its celebration, imposes the precept of confessing quamplimùm.

Others, on the contrary, hold that it should be understood immediately upon the cessation of necessity, and that the priest can conveniently approach the confessional on the same day of the celebration; thus Wigandt translates 11 n. 39., and Sancius cites this opinion, where he adopts the more secure one. But better is P. Milante with the common doctors, as he says in his dictionary proposition 39. Lugo d. 14 n. 163. c.

cum Gratia, Coninch. et Candido, cum Zerola, prop. n. 5. cum qui affert de hoc S. C. Declarationem, dicunt sufficere, ut Sacerdos intrà triduum confiteatur: Pariter ac in c. Eos qui de Sentent. Excomm. in sexto praecepitur, ut ii qui in articulo mortis absolvuntur a excommunicatione reservata, tenentur cum convaluerint se presentare superiori quam commodè poterunt; alias reincidunt in eamdem censuram; et hoc non obstante (ut ajunt Lugo, Milante, et Garcia), non judicantur reincidere si intra triduum se presentant. Thus also 2 c. 10 n. 55. with Ugolino and Sayro says, to gravely violate the precept of referring heretical books to inquisitors is not to release one from keeping it even if one retains those books for two days. The intrinsic reason, however, seems to me to be this: since this precept is merely ecclesiastical (as well approved in 66 s. 6.), it is not deemed that the Church intends to oblige anyone to it with such severity; whence that which must first of all be understood morally, as it is understood in other human laws, namely, in the law concerning final judgment and in the last law.

C. de Felin. Commonly however, Lugo says n. 162 and 163. . 6. Milante, et Diana ll. cc. cum Garcia, et Candido, quod aliquando per accidens ex tali praecepto sacerdos ille teneretur confiteri eadem die, et forte eadem hora, puta si tunc confessarium haberet, quo postea per plures dies carebit, vel si cras eadem necessitas urgeret celebrandi, nec posset confiteri. Quaer. V.

Whether a sacrilegious priest who does not have necessity, or who, while standing in necessity, nevertheless has abundance of a Confessor, is bound to confess as soon as he begins celebrating? Sylvius and others affirm at Croix n. 546. But most commonly and more truly they deny it. Section 7, chapter 66. Lugo d. 14 n. 150. Diana page 9, treatise 2, question 26, with Gran.

Seyr., Gob. c. et quasi communis sententia ut testatur Moya q. 6 § 4. Reason, because the Tridentine precept has been ordered for the purpose of instilling fear in those who delay the Confession under pretense of necessity, but do not sacrilegiously celebrate; to those, however, to whom this precept would very rarely be profitable: namely, those who, despite the divine commandment being disregarded, dare to celebrate sinfully with knowledge. These are more easily inclined to despise the ecclesiastical precept. It teaches well, however, Lugo Resp. mor. l. 4 dub. 47 n. 5, that in positive precepts the argument from lesser to greater does not hold, when the lesser is not contained in the greater, as is the case in our instance, where the precepts are disparate. However, Lugo correctly notes D. 14 n. 150 that if such a priest, out of necessity and omitting contrition, should celebrate, he would nonetheless be bound to confess as soon as possible, because the Tridentine precept demands it. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. It is very little to distinguish between a priest possessing contrition or not possessing it; but it speaks of any priest necessarily as celebrant. This I think should be understood (whatever Croix says at loc. cit.) to refer solely to him who did not have a sufficiency of Confession before the celebration; for if he had had it, the first case would arise in which that would be a real sacrilege and he would celebrate without necessity. 267 Question NoneVI.

Whether he is bound to confess immediately upon celebrating, after a Confession in which he has innocently forgotten some mortal sin? Resp. Si meminerit post celebrationem, utique non tenetur, ut rectè docent et Marc. But Bonaventura and Albertus ibid., as well as Leander in the same place, admit this probably; and even if after Mass, following Communion, he remembers a mortal sin. In the Mass after communion, a mortal sin will be remembered; because truly he would not have celebrated with consciousness of sin, as the Council of Trent says. If, however, he remembered before the celebration but after confession, they say that he was held to have fulfilled the precept of confessing first, c. and many others with him according to Croix l.c. But Croix rightly considers the opposite opinion probable, because here it cannot truly be said that he celebrated knowingly in sin without a previous Confession.

See all that is said in note number 258. Question NoneVII. A Priest, who after consecration remembers a sin, is not prevented by any preceding Confession to confess it at first? They affirm in Mega, etc., according to 14 n. 140.

Reason, because then truly occurred the case in which there presses the Tridentine precept; for then the Priest already celebrates with consciousness of sin in necessity, and without confession. But they deny it at [page] 144 and 126, and Lugo considers it rightly probable. Because in n. 3 it is said that a Priest who before Mass remembers the sin and celebrates out of necessity not having the opportunity to confess, should afterwards confess as soon as he can; but regarding him who speaks of sins after Consecration, Ruhr, n. 4, Cap. II. Dub. II.

On the subject of the Eucharist. 89 he says: It is broken with the intention of confessing it, without what is added with the first. It is asked VIII. Does the aforementioned precept of confessing as soon as possible oblige presumptuous laypeople? The first opinion affirms this, and such is the view held by the Navarrese at Lugo on the 14th day, note 138. Commentary page 341 note 13 and Cont.

Henry and Said. Because, as they say, the same reasoning applies to laics as it does in priests, for where the same reasoning holds, the same disposition of the law holds. The second opinion, however, which is very common and probable to be true, denies this and holds it. Section 66, Chapter 7, and Lucca, Number 139, who asserts that there is a general opposition, Wigandt, page 12, note 32, Article 5. Whoever asserts the common opinion, as stated in Milante, proposition 13, page 95, note 105, along with Candido, Aversa, and Diana, Escobarius, book 20, note 92, together with Bonaccorso. Fill. etc., according to Concilium, loco citato, Ratio; nam et quia predicta regula ex paritate rationis currit in correlativis, æquiparatis vel connexis, non tamen ita hic; tanto magis quia sumus in odiosis, secundum dicta in Tractatus de Legibus, loco 2, n. 200 v.

It is asked. Then because the reason differs for Priests and Laymen. For in priests (generally speaking), who frequently communicate, necessity arises more easily to encounter communication without Confession; and thus priests more easily celebrated with pretext of this necessity without having observed Confession. And this is confirmed by the authority of Wigandt from Saint Thomas, who says: in that which lacks the sufficiency of confession, and where a common necessity presses, it is required to propose the intention of confessing and satisfying, adding nothing concerning obligation immediately thereafter to confess. From which they rightly infer that what follows: if a Priest in necessity without Confession communicated like a layman, he would not be bound to confess immediately; but rather (they add), if he should have to complete a sacrifice begun by another: or if he were to perform the office on Friday, because although then he would not properly say Mass, it would nevertheless be simply said that he was celebrating, as Rubr speaks.

Mass. from that day. go Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

Here finally it refers to note what are the effects of the Eucharist. The principal effect is to confer an increase of grace, as stated by the Councils of Florence and Tridentine, session 13, chapter 2. And sometimes by accident confer the presumed first grace, namely if anyone, ignorant that he is in a mortal sin, or supposing himself to have contrition, and having merely attrition, adds himself to Communion; then from being attrite he becomes truly contrite. Thus St. Thomas, Question 79, Article 3. ... 6 n. 6. 269 Effectus II. It is the Eucharist that remits venial sins, as it is taught in Session 13, Chapter 2, where it is said that this Sacrament is an antidote by which we are freed from daily faults, and by which we are preserved from mortal sins.

And they say with St. Thomas in the article 4, On this matter. Doctor thus says: Now as to the effect of the Sacrament itself it is charity, not only with regard to the habit but also presumed with regard to the act, which is excited in this Sacrament through which venial sins are remitted. Wherefore better says Tourn. p. 629, this Sacrament does not immediately, but only mediately through the act of charity remit venial sins. Effect III is to preserve from mortal sins by means of the sacramental grace that is excited, devotion is strengthened, temptations are more firmly resisted, demons are driven away, etc., as St. Cyril teaches. But they assert that the Eucharist confers a divine presumptuous external protection, by which God does not permit man to be involved in occasions in which He foresaw him as liable to fall. Effectus IV. est remittere poenam temporalem debitam pro peccatis; hoc autem non directe, sed indirecte ratione actuum charitatis, qui per Sacramentum excitantur, ut docet S. cap. 6 n. 3i et Effectus V. est actualis dulcedo spiritualis, qui effectus est quidem infallibilis, si non impeditur ex parte subjecti: consistit autem haec suavitas in promptitudinem voluntatis ad res divinas hilari animo peragendas.

The effect sixth is a special union with Christ and His members, according to John 6. In me manet, et ego in illo: Effectus VII. est adeptio gloriae; Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum. Others have a presumptuous effect from this Sacrament towards the body, as Lugo holds in n. 36, namely diminishing the fuel of concupiscence, exciting good imaginations, sanctifying the very body, conferring resurrection upon the body, and giving it glory. It is indeed very probable that the consecrated species, so long as they are in the stomach, cause greater graces, with a greater disposition approaching, according to Croix n. 524. with Con. Val. Question None

I. Is it a new venial sin to approach the Eucharist with a habitual venial sin? They affirm. 4c. 6n. 3: and c. 7 n. 20. However, they probably deny it, Sotus, Sa, n. 21. Reason, firstly because this is more a deficiency of perfect reverence than positive irreverence; secondly because the very will to receive the Eucharist and its effect is some kind of virtual detestation of vehicular things, whereby guilt is removed so that they themselves minimally impede the fruit of the Sacrament.

It is asked II. He who communicates with an actual venial sin will sin venially and will lose the fruit of the Sacrament? When guilt affects the very Communion itself, as when one communicates for vain glory or some other venial end, no one doubts that a presumptuous venial sin is committed, as they say as if it were certain and true. It is doubtful whether one commits a venial sin by communicating with an actual or virtual

affection of venial sinning, or by means of a concomitant venial fault, for instance through voluntary distraction, or by uttering idle words, and similar actions? They deny it.

Yes, on page 6, note 522, and they consider it probable in decision 66, section 1, verse. To be said is this: Lugo, d. 14, n. 31, and Reg. ac Croix, loco citato, cum dist. 2, qui dicit: Nam habentem adhuc voluntatem peccandi, gravior magis dico perceptione Eucharistiae, quàm purificari. Reason; because such a communicant positively inflicts an injury upon the Sacrament. Concerning the guilt: as regards the fruit or effect of the Sacrament, others say that no one who approaches without actual disposition (which consists in the exclusion of venial fault in the act of communion, and in some pious movement of devotion) will receive any fruit of the Sacrament; and thus St. Thomas holds in IV d. 12 q. 2 art. 10 q. 3 Prænotandum; likewise St. Bonaventure. Saint Anthony.

Alens. et Affirmant. They prove that, moreover, from St. Augustine. Sermon 15 on the Word. Apost. ubi: Non justificat (Deus) non quasi dormientes, non quasi ut non conemur, non quasi ut non velimus.

Translation: Apost.: He does not justify (God) not as if asleep, not so that we are not blamed, not so that we do not will it. Quis igitur fecit te sine te, non te justificat sine te. Then on account of experience, it is observed that many priests celebrate daily in a state of grace, and yet nothing profit. But others more commonly say, such a one is not deprived of any fruit, as in section 3 of chapter 63.

Gonet disp. 8 art. 3. et Lugo d. 14 n. 36. cum Sylvio, Soto, Vasq. Thomas mulaverit sententiam in III p. q. 79 ar. 8, ubi expressè docet, quod licet qui communicat cum veniali concomitante Communione, v.g. cum voluntaria dis- tractione; non recipiat actualem refectionem spiritualem. Cap: II. Dub. H. On the subject of the Eucharist. This very sweetness may, however, receive an increase of habitual grace or charity.

This opinion is indeed much more common, but it does not seem to be entirely unreasonable. ## ARTICULUS II. ## What disposition of the body is required? 271 Does politeness and conjugal act impede Communion? 272 Qu. I. What if the political act were voluntary? And what if it is involuntary? 275 Qu. II.

Whether it is always venial to approach the Eucharist after conjugal intercourse? III. Does a wife, having fulfilled her debt, owe it to abstain from communion on that day? Whether external stain, like leprosy,

impedes participation in communion, and whether at the time of celebration? Whether a menstruant is impeded from communion? An latio armorum? 276 Whether a priest communicant ought to be dressed in liturgical vestments outside Mass? 277 Natural fasting as a prerequisite for Communion.

See Resolutions among Bus. Prenot. In hoc non est de præcepto divino. Note. 2 not to be given in that smallness of matter. Prenot. 3, tres requiruntur ad solvendum hoc jejunium, ex tribus regulis, videlicet Regula I, caput 279. That the thing is taken from without.

Dub. 1. Does a voluntary transgression in regard to the remains of food break the fast? Dub. 2. Does a drop of water mixed with saliva, or a sip of juice, count? Is sugar inserted into the mouth before midnightr?

An aqua hausta de lapsu in flumen? An blood drawn from a finger? What if it should flow forth from the head? Rule II. That it be taken according to the mode of congestion or of drinking. Dub. 1.

Does dust from the snuff taken through the nose break the fast? Dub. 2. Is smoke from tobacco? Dub. 3. Are leaves of tobacco and/or aromatic substances ground with teeth? Rule III, 281.

That which has the reason of food may be taken, or rather. Hence it is asked whether mastication dissolves the fast for foodstuffs such as capillars, a lance, wood, paper, pebbles, chalk, and counterfeit money? Whether it is licit to follow the latest hour among the horological divisions? And what if someone swallows food after the first strike? Whether, in a case of doubt regarding the dissolution of the fast, it is permissible to communicate? See here, and 1. 1 n. 80. g4 Lib.

VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. Is it a sin to take food, or to expel it immediately after Communion? In what cases can one communicate non-judiciously? Is it permissible to give Viaticum again to the sick person who has not fasted? Dub. 1.

How much time should one Communion be separated from another? Dub. 2. Whether one who has communed with but a few on account of devotion, should be bound to receive Viaticum when danger of death approaches? Dub. 3. Whether one who has continually received Communion?

Dub. 4. Can a Priest omit the words: "Accipe Viaticum," etc., when giving

Communion? Can a Priest celebrate Mass without fasting in order to give Viaticum to another? Is it permissible to communicate oneself after taking food, so that the Eucharist may not perish or be treated improperly? For the sake of avoiding scandal? For the completion of the Sacrifice or Communion? For the sake of avoiding death? Is it permissible to communicate before sleep or digestion? "Resp. 1.

No corporal stain per se impedits reception of Eucharistia, cum faciat pauciorem ad bonitatem vel malitiam moralis; potest tamen aliquando per accidens impediri propter effectus secuti. Thus communicated. Whereupon it is resolved. » 1. Non impedit pollutio involuntaria, imò nec voluntaria per poenitentiam expiata, nisi effectum malignum, v.g., turpem recordationem, ac delectionem, vel distractionem, et perturbationem animi relinquat: eo enim casu, eo enim casu, uti et semper post culpabilem, præstat, ac secundùm sententiam communem sub veniali debet differri, nisi aliud sua-deat justa aliqua causa, v.g., magnus fructus festivitatis, regula Ordinis: vel si à Daemone excitata putuìt, ad Communionis frequentiam impediendumdam. . 9 de Matr. d. 13. Good. D. 4, q. 6, n. p. 2.

Card. de Lugo d. 15 sect. 1. 2. Neither does conjugal act prevent, although it is seemly and advisable to abstain, if one rarely communicates, from the night preceding. Thus Fili. and Sanch l. >c. Escob. lib. 7 E. 6 n. 83.

Understand this: if out of necessity he repaid what was owed, neither any perturbation of mind nor any affection for things present does he suffer; but if he had done it for the sake of pleasure, it teaches Regin. l. 29 t. 117. . 5 t. 4 c. 6 n. 10 et 16 that on that day abstention should be (especially if a harmful effect had followed). March. Perez. d. 49 sect. 3 n. 8 adding, to be only venial; but rather indecency can be compensated for by a just cause. * (See what is said here n. 273 de 3.) Similarly, although it is seemly and advisable to abstain from intercourse on that day by reason of Communion, it is not illicit otherwise than for a good end; e.g., out of love for offspring, to avoid the danger of incontinence, or to fulfill a debt. Ex 9 d. 13 et Mart. What you ask I.

Is every pollution always impedes from Communion? This must be distinguished between voluntary pollution and involuntary pollution. If it was voluntary, Navar. and others according to Leandr. say that it is a mortal sin, and immediately after that one should approach the Eucharist, even though contrition and confession have preceded. But this is denied by common opinion with D. 15 from Lugo, n. 1 (where it refers that Navarum changed their opinion in the later edition), Habert t. 5 page 571 v. Furthermore, Nat. . 2 §. 2 n. 11. 367 n. 18. and others similarly.

However (whatever they may say), at least this kind of penitent is to abstain from Communion on that day out of reverence for so sacred a sacrament. Thus Lugo l.c. n. 4. (who calls the opposite opinion false), c. 7 n. 59. 4 a. 8 n. 3. ex D. Thoma in IV D. 6 qu. 1 a. 4 qu. 2 ad 2 qui docet.: It is not advisable to counsel someone who, immediately after a mortal sin and even though contrite and confessed, would approach the Eucharist; rather, unless great necessity urged it, he should abstain for some time on account of reverence. And it is also evident from the chapter on the Testament. i. In the sixth distinction where Gregory writes to n. 59. D. 3 and Bon. D. 4, qu. 6, cum Nuno et aliis passim; nisi scandalum vel alia justa causa exigat Communionem, prout prudentii Confessariorum videtur, ut dicetur in Ruhr.

Here must be noted proposition 22 condemned by which it was said: It is sacrilege to judge those who claim the right to Communion before they have performed due penance for their sins. Nevertheless, this does not prevent the confessor from, if he deems it expedient, at times defer the reception of the Eucharist for a great sinner, just as presumption can sometimes be deferred in absolution, that his constancy may be experienced, or to bring about horror against some enormous sin, as rightly stated in propositions 2 and 353 n. 81 with Mickle and others. Roncaglia however adds in loco citato that it is good to impose such a sinner to perform pious works before he approaches Communion, in order to erase the guilt of the penalty; but this is merely a matter of counsel, according to what is said in the treatise on penance n. 599. Si vero pollutio fuerit involuntaria, dicit D. Thom. in IV l. c., quod si illa frequenter accidat ex opera- tione daemonum, non impediat ad Communione; secus, si proveniat ex alia causa, adhuc sineulla culpa; tunc enim ait, hominem tenere sub veniali ab Communione abstine propter decentiam, tum ratione fœtiditatis quæ contractae sunt à corpore; tum ratione perturbationis quæ consequitur pollutionem. But others commonly and more correctly say that if pollution does not leave any perturbation behind, it impedes communion very little; for the mere corporal stain does not obligate one to abstain from the Eucharist; as in 3rd part, 7th question, 6th article, note 14. with St. Victor, part 3, distinction 68, section 2, verse.

I say according to Soto, Article 7, note 62. Reason, because an external stain, since it is past, does not pertain to moral integrity. And this is even if the pollution arises from a venially culpable cause, for then he exhorts to abstain therefrom only out of counsel. l. g disp. 13 cum p. 13 n. 2. cum Vasq. et 60. cum et Fill. That is confirmed by D. Gregory in the aforementioned chapter on the Testament, where the Pontiff says: if pollution arises from excess of food or drink, this should not prohibit participation in the sacred mystery, but abstain from the offering, as I

think it ought to be humbly done. Where the Gloss comments.

Humbly, he says: Therefore it is counsel, for indeed he can celebrate well if he wishes. It was approved from the 2nd rubric in the Missal on Defects, no. 9, where it is prescribed thus: If there is doubt whether a mortal sin was present in the preceding meditation, one should abstain and not communicate or celebrate outside of necessity; but if it is certain that no mortal sin was present in that meditation, or that no meditation took place at all, but rather that it occurred through natural or diabolic delusion, then he may communicate and celebrate, unless such great perturbation of the mind from bodily disturbance should arise as to make abstention seem necessary. All however agree that it is venial to approach the Eucharist with the said perturbation arising from delectation experienced or from pollution of turpi imagination concomitant therewith; at least so long as endures the mental derangement. Unless man endeavors to repel it as much as he can, so that he may approach devoutly, as they say in c. 6 n. 15. 68 s. 2 v. From this, where St. Justin says: "It is not water to abstain from the mysteries on account of this involuntary passion."

And in book 6, Decretum 13, note 15, with Gerson. Gabr. et Major. Or unless some just cause of necessity or devotion otherwise demands, as the aforementioned authors A.4 state and the same doctor teaches, saying: If necessity looms, or if devotion requires it, such a thing is not hindered. Question. II.

Does a conjugal bond impede from Eucharistic charity? Others absolutely think that a conjugal bond existing on the day of Communion cannot be excused from venial fault, as Mart. l. 9 d. 13 n. 2 states. That they infer from c. Scitis. Cause: 33 q. 4 where 6. Jerome wrote: Whoever fulfills his debt to his wife, nor should he eat the flesh of the Lamb.

On the contrary, others do not recognize any culpability in this, saying that it merely involves a matter of honesty and that one should abstain from Communion. But it must be said that the common DD. is venial; thus one may approach Communion on the same day as the conjugal union took place for the sake of pleasure, because this cannot be excused by any indecency; see S. 8o art. 7 ad 2. 492. v. Prob. 3. . 13 n. 8. cum 8. Bonav. St. Anthony.

Lop. and others many; and it is proven from cap. Vir with one's own. 7. Caus. 33, qu. 4: ubi D. Gregorius ait: Cum vero non amor procreandè sobolis, sed voluptas deminatur in opere Commixtionis; habent Conjuges praesumptum de sud Commixtione, quod defleant. Moreover, they say Sancho n. 8. Antoine page 486 verso. I said, and with others, that any

honest cause can excuse the aforementioned indecency: such as the solemnity occurring, a scandal to be avoided, danger to reputation, Jubilee or gaining indulgences, special devotion, etc. But if the conjunction is made without sin for the cause of procreation, it is certain among all, that although it is fitting to abstain from Communion on that day, as teaches D., this nevertheless remains only a matter of counsel and not an obligation; thus Lugo d. 15 n. 14. c. n. 4 et 5.

Con. pag. 368. in fine, Petrocorens. tom. 3 pag. 432, in fine cum Glossa in dict. cap. Scitis, et Glossa cap. Omnis de et alii communiter, ex D. Vir cum propria, sic scripsit ad Augustinum: Si quis subconjuge non cupidine voluptatis captus, sed solamodo liberorum creandorum gratia utitur, ipse perfectè de sumendo corporis Domini mysterio, suo est relinquendus judicio; quia à nobis prohiberi non debet accipere. Where the Glossa explains what is to be prohibited, namely dis Cap. II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 99 sonderi.

The reason for this common opinion is that the end of procreation, since it is altogether honorable and willed by God, sufficiently remedies that kind of impropriety which exists in communicating after copulation. The text in c. cap. Scitis does not prevent this; for D. Thomas responds in 4: dist. 32 qu. 1 art. ad 1. ex Magistro Sentent. ibid., that the sermon is spoken only of married Church ministers, who are Greeks and to whom it is forbidden to celebrate on days when they come to their wives. Question NoneIII. A husband who makes a beginning should be bound that day after Communion to abstain?

Cajet affirms, n. 11, that (as they say) the submission still leaves a dulling of the mind. But commonly S. and the same with St. Thomas: D. Bon. D. Anton. White. Magno, Carthus.: Speaking of this point, St. Francis de Sales (Introduction, etc., part 2, chapter 20) says: "The creditor, who demands a debt, ought not indecorously to approach Communion, but rather the debtor, who is repaying, should be allowed to do so, saying that it was forbidden in the old law that debts be demanded on feast days, not that they be paid."

And to this corresponds what D. Augustine has written on Psalm 149. If thou dost not exact, render; for the sake of perfect sanctification God will compute unto thee as rendered that which thou returnest when..... thou renderest what is due to thy wife. Reason, because, since the repayment of a debt is an act of virtue, it does not prevent a man from being impeded from Communion. And the same is thought to be said with chapter 15 n. 58 and with Cajetanus Palud et al., that a wife is by no means exempted from the obligation of repaying what is owed through the reason of

receiving the Eucharist; only she can resist it with honest prayers, but not with importunate ones. What, however, should the confessor respond if he is asked by his wife whether he is bound to make reparation on the day of Communion?

Wisely, from *De Matr.* lib. 2 dist. 2 n. 16 and sect. 68 fin., it is taught that one should respond thus: if a husband frequently communicates, for example on all feast days, he is thereby obligated to make reparation lest he be exposed to the danger of sinning against justice or charity; but if he does not communicate frequently, but only on principal feasts, then let him go and ask his wife to abstain in honor of Communion, so that he does not incur her displeasure; for if prayer does not suffice, he may then communicate; unless he suffers from unusual distraction due to reparation, nor will he attempt, as we have said, to repel it. On the day, however, when the husband has already communed, there is no blame in not rendering the debt; they say this in d. 16. They, however, consider it to be a venial sin thereupon. S. Anton. Sylv.

Mire. Turrecræm. c. 21 n. 51. Et pertinet praesumptum quodammodo ad dispositionem corporis accedere ad Eucharistiam corpore et mundo sine aliqua macula notabili quae sit externa et delebilis; nam si esset occulta, non obest; neque si esset perpetua ut lepra, fistula et similis prout dicta sunt communiter. 68 sect. 2 v. I say therefore, and [according to] the fifth book [of] the sixth part [of] the sixth chapter [of] the second section. However, a priest infected with leprosy or some other repulsive disease is prohibited from celebrating publicly, according to chapter Tua nos, de Clerico ægrot., where it is said for scandal and abomination of the people; hence he can celebrate in secret, as stated by Palaus in the same place. But however, women may they communicate during the time of menstruation?

He considers what has been cited that if they themselves conveniently defer communion, they are bound to do so under a venial sin, according to St. Dionysius the Areopagite, who says, such chapter II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. I should not thus affect and touch the body and blood of the Lord with 101 leminas. But more commonly and reasonably they consider, c. et c., with Alensis and Palud., this to be merely a counsel, according to St. Gregory (according to . i tr. i cap. ult. n. 2 v.

(Opposing), qui in Epistola ad Augustinum, loquens de muliere menstruata, sic scripsit: Si ex veneratione magna percipere non praesumit, laudanda est; sed si percipiat, non judicanda: bonarum quippe mentium est ibi praesumptum culpas agnoscere, ubi culpa non est. Si vero mulieres ad Communione modeste accedere, pectore cooperto et sine vano ornatu: unde si quae nimis immodeste accedant, huic neganda est Communio. See

Concina t. 8 pag. 370 n. 4. It is presumptuous to approach the Eucharist with weapons deposited. However, to communicate with a sword is not absolutely forbidden by any law; for it can happen accidentally that there be a venial reason for scandal, as Wigand says in tract. 12 n. 45 and 352 n: 74 with Gob. Moreover, it is fitting for the soldiers of St. John of Acre to approach the Eucharist with the sword, because they thereby manifest zeal for the defense of faith; see Holzrn. loc. cit.. Furthermore, note that when a priest receives the Eucharist in the manner of laics, as Croix says 1. 6 p. 1 n. 556, he should be vested with stola, under pain of excommunication according to the Council of Brachren III reported in cap. Ecclesiastica 9 dist. 23 where it is said: In all ways it is fitting that what each one has received in the consecration of honor, he retain and in oblation or reception of salvation, namely, when a priest approaches the solemnities of Masses, or offers himself as a sacrifice to God, and receives the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, he should not approach otherwise than enveloped by an stole on both arms, according to the manner of each.

Si quis autem aliter egerit, subiecisse sit comminationi excommunicationis. They indeed say that Azorius, in his treatise Turrecremata, book 1, chapter 10, question 28, article 12, and also in his commentary on the Decretum of the Council of Bracharensis, hold that this decree appears today to be abrogated by custom; whence even a venial sin is excused for a priest who communicates outside Mass without vestments. But more truly and commonly. Sectio sexta octava prima. Gauntant. in Bon. d. 4 q. 6 p. 2 n. 2. cum Reg. et Graff. item Barbosa, Henr. et quamvis excusent à peccato mortalí, quia res non est admodum gravis, vel quia ex communi usu non videtur sub gravi recepta: tamen meritò non excusant à veniali: tantò magis, quia hoc præcipitar à Rituali Rom. ubi dicitur: Sacerdotes vero cum stolu communicent; et Glossa in dict. c. Ecclesiástica, dicit: Idem servandum est, si Sacerdos est communitaturus in idem servandum est, si Sacerdos est committaturus in ægriudine.. « Resp. 2. By the precept of the Church, one who is to communicate under mortal sin must regularly fast before communion; that is, from midnight onward, he must take no food, drink, or medicine in any way.

Ita comm. And it is certain from the Councils, which are seen in Fil. . de Lucca, lib. cap. ##, where the matter is resolved. » 1. Although the smallness of the matter does not excuse it, nevertheless it does not hinder Communion I. Relics of foods it is permissible to cast aside accidentally among adhering detestables (for they deny n. 47 and Diana who probatively affirm the contrary) without any doubt ought res. 37 et p. 4 t. 4 res. 104 see 6 and where it notes, this sentence II.

Blood, or any other fluid flowing from the head, and a spitted aqua or wine, by chance through washing of the mouth, or a drop of juice while the taste is explored, in the manner of saliva, with which it is mixed, or a louse to be breathed in. The reason is because these are either not taken, namely from without, or not through the mouth, Chapter II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 105 "while food, or drink."

See Chapter 5, Article 3. » Cardinal de Lugo, loco citato, numerus 23. III. If you place upon your tongue an aromatic substance or a leaf of tobacco for any reason, a mastic, or something else to taste, provided that you transmit nothing. Card. de Lugo R. mor. l. i d. g Idem teaches about the smoke of tobacco 8 n. 4 (although it is very much to be deprecated unless there be just cause; and he collects this from . 3 where he treats of the same powder drawn through the nostrils.) Card. de Lugo Mor. tom. i d. 9.

» 2. It is probable that the Communion not be impeded if one swallows a crumb of wood, paper, parchment, nail, or pebble; because it does not have the nature of food or drink. . cit. R. 38. and treatise on celebration. R. 52. ex contra et alios, cujus est sententiae magis tutio. See Cardinal de Lugo, and Escob.

3. It is not permissible to communicate these cases. I. If you spit out the decoction of liquorice, dissolved in mouth with saliva. If however there is a doubt whether it was swallowed after the twelfth hour or whether it was done post-prandium, the probable teaching indicates . i t. i c. i contra Sach. c. R. 29 et supra l. i tom. i c. 2 d. 3.

II. If at evening, lying down, you have placed something in your mouth against hoarseness, unless you are certain, do nothing after mid-night, thinking that you have transmitted nothing. Thus. Card. de Lugo l. c. n. 37, and others.

It is licit to follow any dissonance between clocks, presuming the last one, provided that it does not err: because it stands as a good author, making an opinion probable, as Sanchez says in l. 2 d. i de Matr. Sancus. Card. de Lugo n. 45: c. R. 36. * (Vide infra n. 282.) III. If you have taken something, even though you may soon reject it. IV. If you have conveyed the smoke of tobacco into the stomach, as it is taught in 5.

"However, in III. part., chap. i, d. 8 he denies." V. If at the first Mass of the Nativity of the Cardinal, he should take part in the ablution, or should moisten his fingers slightly with water or wine. See Bonaventura, Dialectica IV, quaestio 6, part 2. » If all these things are diligently

discussed and examined, it is shown that fasting naturally prior to Communion is not required by divine law, but only by ecclesiastical law, according to the chapter Ex parte de Caelær.

Miss. and various Councils, especially from the Council, Constantiensi, see the aforementioned in lib. I cap. 8 num. v. And what. The preachers 2. that in this fraction of the fast, although this precept is binding by ecclesiastical law, yet it shall not be a matter of slight concern: because the precept is no longer that one should approach the Eucharist fasting, but that one should not approach after eating or drinking; and whoever communicates after any minimal part, already communicates after eating or drinking. Thus all whatsoever DD. Gibert and Pasqual say, who are not to be hearkened to.

Prænotandum 3. quod ad hoc jejunium frangendum juxta communem sententiam tria requirantur, nempe I. That which is taken, may be taken from without. II. Quod ad hoc jejunium frangendum juxta communem sententiam tria requirantur, nempe I. Ut quod sumitur, sumatur ab extrinseco. That which is taken, may be taken by means of eating or drinking. III.

That the thing consumed may have the reason of food or drink. On this matter, sections 4 and 5 treat in part 6, chapter 6. Continuation of Tournai. to. 5. page 4 question 2. Palau de Bonaventura, idem titulus, dissertatione quarta, quaestio sexta, paginis duae. Lugo d. 15.

Concina treatise 8 page 13 question Escobedo de Eucharistia book 20. Holzma. to. 1 de Renzi eod. tit. to. 2 c. 4. .. 12. Esam. 4. Roncaglia de . tit. qu. 4. art. 8. . 6 p. 1 ex n. 560. Sporer to. 3 p. 158.

Ebel to. 3. p. 90. You may see their places in the aforementioned Authors, when below you will find the cited passages. According to Rule I. To break the fast requires that something be taken from outside; this is taught by Croix n. 560. Ebel n. qi. . 4.

Sporer 466. and P. in section 4 from D. Thom., who in four distinguished questions, eighth distinctio, first question, article four, second distinction says, that whatever is procured intrinsically and not taken from an extrinsic source by the mouth is not truly eaten, and therefore does not break natural fasting. But Cap. II. Give. Two. On the subject of the Eucharist. There is doubt 105: whether voluntary transfer of the remains of the food breaks the fast?

The first opinion denies it, and this is the teaching of Suarez, section 4,

point v. Thirdly, Eblel n. 99. Fourth page 3. title 9 section i difference 1. 4 R. 37 with Tabien and they consider it probable Escob n. 341 with Moffes. Ochagav. Petitio sic. item Tanner.

Leand. et Gob. apud Croix n. 567: Ratio, quia reliquiae cibi pridie sumpti, cum non recipiantur ab extrinseco die Communionis, moraliter reputantur partes comestionis praecedentis diei; unde, quamvis ex industria trajiciantur, moraliter non constituunt novam comestionem, sed praeteritam perficiunt. Added: another reason. It seems new that this opinion is different from the Rubric 3, where it is said thus: If the remaining fragments of food in the mouth are transglutinated, they do not impede Communion, since they are not transglutinated as food, but as saliva. The second opinion is more widespread and affirms this; and this is held by D. 8 ad 4 where it says: Residues of food remaining in the mouth, if tasted with relish, do not impede the reception of this Sacrament. Therefore, if they are transglutinated with intent, they impair; and thus the presumed Cacas consider it c. 5 n. 7. .

Filius de quarto articulo octavo numerali quarta. Antoines p. 487. Reason, because such a transfer of relics, when done with industry, seems to be a new composition. The first opinion seems improbable, but this second one is more probable and altogether to be preferred: as rightly they say, and although there may not be scruples in this matter, it is wisely observed by P. 16, n. 36, which the Most Reverend N. P. Benedict of Sacr. embraces. Mass book tomes 3 question 17 chapter 17: because the relics which have been dislodged from the teeth, and which sensibly are perceived in the tongue, certainly should be spat out: but there is no obligation to use diligence to extract those relics from the teeth if they are swallowed unintentionally without being removed; otherwise this obligation would be subject to countless scruples and perplexities, which certainly the Church did not presume to wish to oblige.

Is there doubt whether water mixed with saliva from tasting vinegar, if swallowed with intent, breaks the fast? If the aforementioned guttulae are accidentally spilled, it is certain that they do not break the fast, provided that they are not in large quantity; thus all with D. 8 ad. 4, where he says: And the same reasoning applies to other waters or wines which cleanse the mouth, as long as they are not spilled in large quantity but mixed with saliva, which cannot be avoided. Therefore, a doubt arises whether, if swallowed with intent, Sentiunt would not break the fast; and this is so, provided that they are mixed with saliva: and the same opinion seems to be held by Lugo n. 33. And while they say that it is not considered drinking of saliva, for this reason they do not consider these drops swallowed in the manner of saliva as breaking the fast. But it must

absolutely be affirmed in common with what follows in the third place: that Sylvius and that D. Thomas teach the same thing in the aforementioned passage, namely, after having said that remnants of food do not break the fast if they are casually swallowed, he also said that the same reasoning applies to other liquids by which the mouth is washed, as was related above. It is confirmed from the rubric l.c., where it stands thus: The same must be said (namely, that the fast is not broken), if water is swallowed while washing the mouth, apart from intention.

Therefore, if broken through intention. The same must be said if someone introduces sugar into the mouth at night and afterwards something is swallowed after midnight, as taught by Renzito 1. 1. 3 tract. 4 c. 4 q. 7 with Coninch etc., commonly, whatever others may say, according to 14 H 51. Reason, because there is no remainder of the previous day's consumption, but it is a contained nourishment. Let it be supposed: he who takes water breaks the fast, although according to Chapter II. Doubt. II.

On the subject of the Eucharist. Voluntarily, either because it is carried away by the stream, or because another forces it into his mouth through that power, as they say and as with Lugo. Likewise indeed if anyone should lick blood from a finger, or tears flowing from the eyes, as commonly they say. 4. Mazzotta to. 3 p. 149. et Croix cum Lugo, et Secùs verò dicendum, si quis deglutit sanguinem defluentem ex capite vel gingivis, aut saniem ex pustula oris emanantem, etiàm ex industria, ut communiter docent Suarez sect. 4. v. Why, Habert says on page 487, volume 5. Eibel n. 99. Antoine p. 485.

Concina n. 6. Roncag. qu. 6 R. 2. et v. True). Reason, because, as was aforementioned according to St. Thomas, whatever comes from within is not truly eaten, nor does it truly break a fast. The rule II. is this: in order to break the fast, something must be taken either by way of eating or drinking; this rule commonly they teach from Lugo, d. 15, n. 28. Sylv 3 p. q. 80 v. 8. and others similarly throughout.

But there is doubt i. Does he violate the fast by consuming powdered tobacco through the nostrils? Antoine de Leone and Lez affirm, ap. Lugo Resp. Moralis liber primus, dubia quaedam nonnullae unum et valde ducit in principium.

But commonly others deny this, even if something is transmitted to the stomach; because although such matter is nutritive, it is not taken through the manner of digestion, but through attraction. Therefore, 4. Lugo l.c. Eibel n. 92. Cross n. 570. with Aversa, Renzi q. 7. and Diana p. 8 tr. 7 R. 3.

with Marchant. and Leand. This opinion is indeed most probable, both on account of the adopted rule, and on account of universal custom, since everywhere it is permitted to use the aforementioned tobacco before Mass, as the Pope Benedict teaches.

XIV. concerning the Synod, lib. 7, cap. 63, where incidentally he refers; formerly from Innoc. X. et XII. emanatam fuisse excommutnicationem in eos, qui sumerent tabacum per nares in Vaticano, idemque praescripsisse Urbanum VIII. in Ecclesiis Diocesis Hispaniensis; sed deinde hanc prohibitionem abstulisse Benedictum XIII. Whereupon he concludes thus: Nevertheless today the common usage has been established (the use of tobacco), so that it causes no scandal to anyone. Likewise, what has been said about tobacco is also said of water that is passed through the nostrils at the place of Saint Faustus. But thou sayest: The attractive action is neither potative nor manducative.

It would be replied that although this action is not naturally ordered to pour drink or food into the stomach, yet it is so ordered by the very thing that attracts; and hence, from such an intention, it acquires a moral reason for drinking or eating, provided that proper matter intervenes and an action suitable to the end of projection into the stomach. The same must be said of him who shall swallow dust or powder, a flake of snow, a gnat, or even a fly; for if this should happen by chance through respiration, it certainly would not break the fast, as is commonly taught. Questio resumpta est, Lugo n. 34. Haberi p. 476. Renzl q. 5. with . and others frequently: because such an action is not eating but breathing, which the Church did not wish to prohibit; for who could avoid swallowing something of dust with the wind?

It would be otherwise (as rightly teaches Lugo n. 36.), if anyone should wish to cast a gnat or dust into his mouth, because these would not be mere breathing, but voluntary ingestion. And rightly does Lugo say in n. 35: if someone were to swallow something, for example one thing inserted into his mouth by another person, even though he himself did not intend it and accidentally swallowed it while breathing, because the Church did not wish to hinder Communion on account of things that are taken in through respiration with the air, but only those which do not come about through respiration with the air. Doubt is cast. Does smoke from tobacco, or similar [things], break a fast? Lezana and Antoine, following de Leone, affirm equally that in some way presumptuous smoke is nourished.

They, however, commonly and more probably deny it, as Sporer n. 467. Croix n. 570. cum cum . Prep. et . Diana, and Villal. Benedictus follows the same opinion.

XIV. Concerning the Mass, in the ninth tome, book third, chapter seventeen: testifying that this has been confirmed today by the common consent of all the DDs. Reason, because tobacco smoke is neither food nor drink, and it is not consumed through eating or drinking; otherwise we should say that those who in the kitchen inhale the smoke of foods are breaking a presumptuous fast. And this is the reasoning: if the fume is voluntarily introduced into the stomach, as they probably say, 7. in the question of Renzi, q. 7., c. et March. and contra c. when there is doubt 3. Let him break his fast who takes a leaf of tobacco or its aroma, and chews it with his teeth and expels phlegm? They affirm the same, and Hanno according to Tournel, because (as they say) something is always drawn into the stomach, and for this reason phlegm is expelled.

But they deny l. 1 d. 9. ex n. 2. . 7. cum Pasqu. et 13 R. 1. When the Council, etc., and they consider this to be probable with certain laws and codes, as Imò Lorichius says when swallowed: but this Bonaventure and Tamino rightly do not admit, because then it seems rather to be taken in the manner of food; yet this is to be understood if a grain is swallowed, but not if some very small part is swallowed which is insensibly mixed with saliva, because this then truly is carried by means of saliva. All, however, agree that this kind of mastication is indecent before Communion; whence I think that it cannot be excused by a venial fault unless some cause subsist. Rule III. is, that for breaking the fast what is taken must have a proportion to food or drink. Hence there is doubt whether the consumption of hair, unguents, wood, papyrus, stones, and similar things impedes Communion?

There are three opinions. The first opinion universally denies, because all these things do not have the nature of food, or at least are not used as eatable substances. Thus 4. res. 28. Renzi q. 4. cum Jo. Delacruz, Ludovico, from the aforementioned source, and no. 70.

The second opinion is universally affirmed in return, because (as they say) reverence toward the Eucharist requires not only that no food be eaten, but also that no food be swallowed in any manner. Idem et pro hoc dicto citant etiam D. ad 4 ubi dixit: Nec refert, utrum aliquid hujusmodi nutriat vel non nutriat, dummodo sumatur per modum cibi vel potius. The third opinion, however, commonly teaches that fasting is not much broken if absolutely indigestible things are eaten, such as hair, nails, metal, glass, silk or woolen threads, small bones of fruits thoroughly purified: because these neither nourish nor have the nature of food; whereas only the Church prohibits taking Holy Communion after a meal or drink, as is evident from Canon 2 where it says: "No one shall presume to celebrate

Mass after having eaten or drunk even the smallest amount." And from the Council. Matiscensis: that earthly food not be preferred to heavenly food.

The same thing says St. to Januarius: That the Holy Spirit may be in honor of so great a Sacrament placed upon the lips. Before the Christian body enters the Lord's Body, other foods indeed. Thus it is said. All., 5. Sporer n. 467. and Lugo n. 28. with Henry.

Nunno: And therefore neither after the assumption of water or any other food, or perhaps even after presumed medicine, is it permissible to receive this Sacrament; nor does it matter whether anything of this kind nourishes or does not nourish. Note this something of this kind. Therefore that which nourishes or does not nourish. Moreover, it could happen that the food be lawfully vomited forth, and thus not nourish; and hence he said that something of this kind impedes Communion, whether it nourishes or does not nourish. According to what has been previously stated concerning things digestible which can be altered by the stomach and converted into the substance of man, such as paper, chaff, thread from flax, medicinal powder, wax (since wax almost always retains some honey for mixing); so too with earth or clay, which women are accustomed to eat, provided that something is found in it alterable by the stomach and nutritious. Whether, however, among many clocks there is disagreement, let someone be permitted to follow the last one in order to receive Communion?

Meroka et Salas negant. Dianam p. 4. tr. 3. Reply 19. But most commonly affirming Sanch, in II lib. de Matr., dist. 41., n. 40. Fourth p. 3. title 9. doubt 3.

Merati in Dionysio, loc. cit. Sporer page 159. note 471. 1 page 38 note 180. as common he asserts, Croix number 581: Lugo. day 15. number 45 with Fag. Sanction, and at the end with Pasch. S. Dummodo de errore non constet, ut bene advertunt Lugo et Escob. Or rather, as Crotz adds, the clock is not among those things which are presumed to err most frequently, because these are always presumed to err.

Whether, however, he can communicate who has partaken of food after the first stroke but before the last? They affirm with the Reasoner (as they say) that the last stroke completes the hour morally in such a way that all strokes are counted as one. But Lugo denies this in his d. 15 n. 37., and Croix with the Ratio, because at the first stroke of the hour, midnight is already past, as the most skilled clockmaker confirmed to me presumptuously. I nevertheless feel as certain to hold that the time of midnight is to be understood physically rather than morally; for if it could be understood morally, why should the opinion of Caramuel not be

admitted, who says that one should not be prevented from Communion even though he has swallowed food shortly after the last stroke of the clock? But this is commonly held by the Doctors and by themselves.

Whether, however, in a negative doubt, if it is not yet midnight, someone can communicate? It is very probable, or perhaps more probable, the affirmative judgment, as observed in law 1, n. 80 with Busemb. Sporer, etc., to which add here Cardinalis in Crisi 1, d. 26, n. 87, tr. 13. R. 2. Gobat. a. 280. . 3. de c.) de non accedendo ad Eucharistiam post comestionem, non teneris ab illa abstinere, quamdiù non es certus, et tantò magis, si nullam habeas rationem probabilem te comedisse; tunc enim adhuc manes in possessione tue libertatis. 4.

It is not a sin, speaking generally, to take or reject food immediately from Communion, as stated. Thomas teaches in question 6, part 1, note 25: whence he who had supped a little before midnight on Saturday preceding the Nativity of the Lord, could nevertheless celebrate immediately after midnight; Diana and others teach this in part 3, section 1, article 4, response 44. * (See note 289 at the end.) * Although out of reverence for the Sacrament it is advisable to abstain until the species are consumed; yet it seems certain that within half a quadrant (within one hour in a layman [within a quadrant in a priest]), this must be done by all; Cardinal de Lugo decides, chapter 12, section 3, note 54, according to the judgment of physicians consulted: from a strong stomach more quickly than from a weak one, yet regularly within an hour all consume the species. He also notes that some infirm person may have rejected entire species after midday. All agree that it is fitting for those communing to abstain from expelling for some time interval; yet they say Holzrn. vol. i. de De wingandt tr. tr. 12 n. 45. and Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 549. that there is no sin in expelling after Communion, if no fragment of the host remains in the mouth. Autem licet edere vel bibere statim post Communiationem? Formerly it was prescribed from the Third Canon that fasting should be observed after Communion until midday, but this precept has long been abrogated, as taught by St. Thomas at that time in III, qu. 80, art. 8 ad 6.

Whereupon Holzrn. loc. cit. today no one at all would commit sin by eating immediately after Communion. But this is not more correctly admitted by Croix ibid., unless some cause be present; for instance, if a Religious after Mass should receive permission to approach the table; otherwise such a meal, while the species of the consecrated bread still remain in the stomach, is not excused from venial fault on account of some irreverence, as the cited authors teach: "It must, however, be there some delay between the reception of this Sacrament and the consumption of religious foods." How long, however, do the species consecrated remain in

the stomach? See what is said in n. 225. "I have said in Respells regularly: because one who is not fasting 284 licitly communicates in the following cases, if such a fast cannot be observed without notable inconvenience," as admonishes the Council and Bonac.: according to Diana p. 9 cap. 6. R. 42.

» 1. In danger of death, whether it be through sickness, wound, poison, or by the sentence of a judge. And he who is in the same disease, even though he would not be bound, can yet after a certain number of days—e.g., six, seven, or presumptively—as he thinks . de Lugo)—repeatedly receive viaticum without fasting, provided that he cannot fast and that the danger of death recur, as is taught by the commentary. Or even if it remains, contrary to de Lugo s. 3 n. 65. Nay, although it is not permissible for a sick person to communicate solely out of devotion without fasting; yet if the disease were prolonged, and communion could not be given unless after medicine, it seems probable that this would be permitted, teach Suarez, 30 days, as others say eight. or even three days, as some say seven, or six according to Sylvius and others.

» Arm. Zamb. R 77 others permit as often as it is necessary for a healthy person to fast: thus 6 from Hurt. others finally are able to do so immediately on the following day, out of just cause, namely, that if he should abstain with difficulty because of custom and desire or devotion, there appears to be a moral danger of death. Thus . 5 tr. 4 c. 9 n. 20. But in this matter regard must be had to the custom of the place, which now at least seems to permit that, when the illness and danger are prolonged for a long time, Communion may again be given non jejuno after seven or eight days.

See De Lugo, d. 15, sect. 3, de Euchar. It is asked whether it is permissible to again administer communion to the sick one unfasted, who has already been fortified with Viaticum? Whatever anyone may say, the true and common opinion is that affirmed by Suarez, 3 parts, treatise on divine doctrine, section 68, article 5, chapter 4, note 20. But, when Chapter II. Doubt.

II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 116. 64. When SA and ARM bear witness, and Blessed Benedict XIV testifies in the Synod, book 7, chapter 12, no theologian of any name denies this proposition. The reason is that this Sacrament is not given precisely to satisfy a precept, but as a safeguard against temptations which are more pressing at the time of death; and this not only if a new danger recurs, but also if an assumed one continues, as Sylvester says. Eucharistia n. 3. Ebel t. 3 p. 101 n. 129. (qui testatur hanc esse communem praxis Ecclesiae, et . . cc. cum Soto, XIV. l. c. n. 5. ubi sic addit: Episcopus insinuet Parochis posse et debeo Viaticum

in eadem infirmitate iterum ac tertio administrari, praesertim si aegrotus exposcii; et svelit, penam decernat in Parochos qui aegrotis devote postulantibus iterum et tertio Eucharistiam deferre detectent fulsis praetextibus.

Neither does Vasquez, in his number 4, say the same thing as Blessed, as falsely assert Busemb. and Lugo; for Vasquez speaks only of the obligation of the precept, which he considers to be satisfied by a single reception of the Eucharist. But there is doubt i. How much time should intervene between one Communion and another? The common opinion holds that it should be distanced by about eight days, according to c. Tournai d. p. 485 from the ancient Roman Ritual. Escob. lib. 20 cum Sylv. et Fill. ac sed non improbabiliter n. 20.

Escob n. 363. and Doubt is cast. Whether, if anyone has communed with a few persons out of devotion a short time before, he is bound to receive Viaticum when danger of death comes? The first opinion, more common, denies it, even if Communion preceded by about eight days; this is held by Lugo, d. 15, n. 39, when he asserts that communion should be received. Question 4, Response 1. 4 question 7, part 1, note 2, with the Council. If anyone shall have communicated with a few persons from devotion in the days preceding, he is bound to receive Viaticum when danger of death comes? Fill.

Table. Henry Molf. . 69, sect. 3 §. You will ask, (who both with Soto and Ratio, but also because the precept of Communion has already been fulfilled in substance through the previously received Communion; but also because therefore it is held that man should communicate in the article of death, so as to prepare himself for the transition from this life, but now he is deemed sufficiently prepared, who communicated a little while ago. This opinion is sufficiently probable, namely (as they say in c. et Lugo n. 53). If the danger of death naturally occurs, because then it had already begun to morally threaten in that brief preceding time, even though it was unknown. The second opinion, however, is deemed more probable, which those who follow Vasquez hold in chapter 214, decree 2, note 14.

Palaus l.c. Concina p. 320 n. 14. You inquire with Habert, with Hurri. Tower chapter 8 note 7. Reason, because this divine command, according to the precise interpretation of the Church, obliges instantaneously under the peril of death, so that we may fortify ourselves against enemies with this divine protection; therefore, it is not fulfilled through Communion received out of devotion; for what cannot be congruously satisfied before the debt is contracted, neither can the precept be fulfilled before its

obligation arises. Neither does it hinder to say that he who has communed but a little while before has already sufficiently fortified himself against the imminent danger of death, and thus has already fulfilled the end of the precept; for if this were valid, those who had communed on Palm Sunday would not be bound by the Paschal Communion, which no one will say.

Doubt is cast. Whether one who has communed merely out of devotion is bound to, or can receive the Viaticum in case of urgent peril of death? There are three opinions. The first opinion asserts that he must be held to do so, because at that time Viaticum must be received in order to fulfill the divine precept; this is held by 3 R. 33. cam. Hurr.

Turp. Objection. Chapter II. Dub. Two.

On the subject of the Eucharist. 117 and p.: 10 tr.: 11 R. 4. with Pell. thus holding XIV. de Syn: 1. 7 c. 11. and considers it probable and 6 R. 17. with the Society of Jesus Panormi anno 1636. The third opinion, which they hold . 69 sectio 2. and Contra Gran. et ; this case should not be admitted without necessity: yet Concina doubts whether one who is inflamed with a fervent love could seek to receive Viaticum after it has been postulated. N. P. Bened thinks all these three probable opinions worthy. XIV. 1. c. he saying: In so great a discrepancy of opinions, it will be whole for the parish priest to embrace that opinion which has more pleased him. Moreover, the opinion of Lutonensis, d. 16, n. 53 and 54, seems to me more probable, who distinguishes between a natural disease, and he who distinguishes between a natural and violent disease, and says that if anyone has been struck by a wound or has fallen from a height, he can communicate (or rather is bound, according to our opinion in the aforementioned Doubt), because here truly he did not receive Viaticum at the point of death; and he says that if anyone has been struck by a wound or has fallen from a height, he can communicate (or rather is bound, according to our opinion in the aforementioned Doubt), because here truly he did not receive Viaticum at the point of death; but otherwise, if someone who is already in an illness condition has communicated frequently out of devotion, then it can be rightly said morally that he was in danger of death when he received Communion, since that disease was already dangerous in itself, although not yet known.

And I think that this should be said likewise; for such diseases are judged to already exist in their causes, even though they may not be known. Here however it should be diligently noted with reference to Article 8, Number 9, and others, that if a sick person can easily take Viaticum on the following day, he certainly ought to wait; yet if there is danger of death, or if he cannot conveniently await, then one might think that the proper

medicine should be deferred, or that the Eucharist should be administered out of season at night, as he says. They conveniently add regarding the remainder . c. with Soto, Navarr. The damned, however, can properly receive communion without fasting if the Judge does not wish to delay execution of the death penalty for so long that they might be able to receive communion while fasting, as rightly say and Wigandt translates 12 n. 49. Dubitatur 4.

Whether a ministering Priest can sometimes omit those words prescribed in the Ritual: Accipe Viaticum, etc.? The Clericat negates this. Because (as they say), those words are very profitable that may be received by the Church according to ordinance; and because the Roman Rite makes law concerning those things which are prescribed therein; since Paul V said in his Bull that they should observe them inviolably. Probabiliter tamen affirmat ipse de 1 c. 1 §. 12 n. 6 p. 44 ex Pasq., in casu quo infirmus magnam animi tristitiam Communionem per modum Viatici sit suscepturus. To satisfy the precept of Viaticum, it is not required that there be an intention to satisfy the precept; rather, it suffices that the work of the precept be placed, according to what is said in number 176. Or at least it is sufficient that there be an interpretative intention to satisfy the obligation, which is more pressing. As for those very words prescribed by the Ritual, Alexander responds with the Consul in 36 §. Neither does everything that is prescribed in the Ritual fall under precept, but certain things are prescribed thereunder by a different obligation, and some merely prescribed on account of decency: nor does the Pontiff remove them from their order, but only ensures that what proceeds within their own order do so rightly; for these are the words of the Bull: Therefore we exhort Bishops, Vicars, Parochial priests, etc., that in future they use the Ritual in sacred functions and observe inviolately those matters of decorum which the Catholic Church has approved and established by its ancient usage.

Therefore, they shall observe inviolately the Cap.: II. Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. It regards only those things which (the Church, and the approved usage of antiquity have established.

Furthermore, whatever may be the case regarding this point, even if everything pertaining to it were to fall under the precept in the Rite, in no way can it be said that the precept for pronouncing those words would induce a grave obligation; for the words which are substituted suffice well to excuse us from committing a venial sin in order not to grieve greatly one who is weak. Finally, although it may seem probable 4 286 § 242, and Cardinal de Lugo teaches what is taught in the Major of Dignity on Day 9 § 3. Fern. de hered. etc. (5 1. 4 c. 6 n. 21) limitat ad casum necessitatis, quo

moriturus alud Sacramentum suscipere non posset et scandalum cessaret, possit non jejunum celebrare- ad dandum alteri Viaticum, eò quod hoc sit juris: divini jejunium verò ecclesiastici tantùm; ideòque non tantùm posse, sed etiam tenêri dicat id n. 12. id tamen meritò communiter rejicitur, tum quia contrarium probat praxis; tumquia major est habenda ratio Sacramenti quàm aliqualis necessitatis proximi: tumquia praeceptum Viatici non obligat, quandò non potest ritè dari. Thus from De Eucharistia, distinzione 9, differenziatio 17. » teaches. C. de Lugo to be » more probable.

V. 4 Resp. 33. The priest, however, who is near death (whether natural or whether near violent death), without doubt can celebrate [the Mass] fasting if that is otherwise held not to be possible: because it does not involve more than to communicate with a taken foodstuff. Card. de Lugo d. 15 s. 4. It is asked whether the priest, in order to administer Viaticum, may celebrate not fasting? The first opinion alternates, and this is held by Father also in part.

Lugo, n. 67 cap. 15, et probabilem vocant Esc. l. 20, n. 368. 4 ar. 8, n. 9; 2 res. 78, et Lugo in loco cum Filli- liis et Ratio: quia hoc casu praeferendum est praeceptum divinum ecclesiastico; tumque quia idem praeceptum ecclesiasticum, cum permittat moribundo communicare non jejuno, praesumptum permittere censetur Sacerdoti non jejuno celebrare ut infirmum commu- nicet. The second however common and more probable opinion denies this, and this is held by those with Busemb. and supra (who assert that the common opposition should be rejected generally, but unjustly so). Reply to 2. 7 n: 77. Renzi t. 1 da c. n. 68. cum . Anton.

Soto, Coninch. et Sic respondentur ad primam rationem oppositae sententiae. It is answered concerning the second point, that permission to receive Communion without fasting be granted to the dying, because in this very case there concur both the ecclesiastical precept regarding fasting and the divine commandment about receiving Viaticum, which in such a case should take precedence. It is otherwise with the Priest, for he is bound by a single precept alone, namely not to celebrate Mass except when fasting; himself he cannot violate this, so that the moribund may fulfill his precept, to which in such a case the moribund is not even presumptuously bound, since through him it does not stand. Neither hinders it to say that a priest, conscious of mortal sin, can celebrate without previous Confession for giving Viaticum, nor presumptuously without fasting; then indeed the priest can dispose himself by contrition and thus remove the obstacle; but not fasting, since he cannot thereafter remove the obstacle having violated the fast. Therefore, he cannot avoid irreverence, according to what is said in a similar case n. 262 D. 2. First

sentence probable in Chapter II.

Give. Two. On the subject of the Eucharist. I think otherwise, but this second option seems more probable to me, unless (as they rightly say, c. 4, n. 21; c. 5, art. 6, n. 3, and Escob., loc. cit.) a dying person could not be supplied with the Sacrament of Anointing or Extreme Unction; for in that case the Eucharist might be a sacrament of necessity, so that he may become crushed by attrition. But it should be said according to another opinion, that if the Priest, being near death, ought to celebrate in order to receive Viaticum; because then he can celebrate not fasting and thereby satisfy the precept of Viaticum; for in that same person there concur the ecclesiastical precept and the divine one which is to be preferred: Thus commonly with Busemb. c. Lugo n. 69. Renzi quest 4 et cum akiiis passim. « 2.

If there is a danger that the Eucharist may either perish or be badly handled, he can communicate even without fasting, and moreover, if another layman should do it: (This is commonly held as stated in n. 86.) Not. II.) Otherwise, it is also probabili- ter possible even for the present Priest that a layman may receive, as they teach in 221 n 48. » 3. If a serious scandal will arise from the omission of the Sacrifice, or of Communion.

Which nevertheless some think can hardly happen, on account of what might occur by chance, they say: The priest has taken something by accident, and therefore it is hindered. If after the Consecration a Priest remembers that he is not fasting, it is certain that he is not bound to remain or to desert the Mass, since the divine precept to complete the Sacrifice outweighs the ecclesiastical requirement of fasting. See 10 c. 33 q. 3. et Bon. d. 4 q. 6 p. 2 n. 19. qui cum Henriq. . 70. Bon. l. c. p. 1 n. 16. Conc. to. 8 p 364 n. 10.

Turner to volume 5, page 482, chapter 7, note 79, with reference to the book. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. . Article 6, ad 2, where it says: I would consider it safer, especially in cases of necessity... that one abandon the begun Mass, unless a grave scandal be feared.

They consider it more prudent, and Sotus and Anglo presume as probable on this account, that one should never cease from the Mass begun, because it is hardly ever possible to omit that without some scandal. On the contrary, Concina says, rarely does this happen to cause scandal. I feel it better to say with Tournely that one should always fear a scandal unless the celebrant is noted or at least presumed to be of good probity. "I have said, scandal: because some kind of disturbance or inconvenience will

follow; for example, if he were to take something initially without sufficient note, he does not indicate it as prepared * (unless grave circumstances should happen to be present." Cross n. 583. cum) * 288. 4. If the perfection of the Sacrifice, or of the Communion should be required... This can happen in five ways.

I. If for the species of wine he has taken water (which if he perceives while it is in his mouth, it should not be spewed out on account of the danger of ejecting a fragment of the host and irreverence, but rather swallowed . Sacr. lib. 2 cap. 8. Card. de Lugo d. 15. * (Et idem recte dicit Concina pag. 363 n. g.)* tunc enim tenetur denuo consecrare *(utramque materiam)* quod fieri praesumptum potest, consecrando et offerendo statim, sine nova hostia: *(Ut Scotus, 2 n. 545. At the rubric of the Missal concerning both opinions (not that a new host should be consecrated, nor even that wine alone can), it is taught to be probable if celebrated publicly. See among [the authorities]. (When Con. and Gob. are cited according to Croix, l. 6, p. 2 n. 535, yet still when Pasq. and Avers. say, according to being, another wine should be consecrated, unless a prudent person is present; otherwise, other material would have to be awaited for some time, as stated in n. 536.) See the aforementioned n. 206. v.

As regards.)* II. If the celebrant fails after the Consecration: for then another is bound to perform it, if one presumptuously fasting cannot fast, to complete it. III. If after Consecration it is remembered that one of a certain kind has not fasted: then he is bound to proceed; indeed, the presumptuous one can proceed if before Consecration it is remembered, and without scandal, and it cannot be noted as having ceased, v.g. in Solemn Sacrifice, as the common teaching explains *(See what is said n. 262. dub. 1.)* IV. If after ablution one has received Communion, even though he may have distributed it for a long time, the remaining relics are presumed to be greater in quantity that which was consecrated in the same Sacrament; (As when Con. .) what I add is this: namely, that then it is not permitted to take particles of another Sacrifice which are in the ciborium, for that purpose of expurgation, as they teach at Lugo l.c., even though it may seem probable otherwise : if several Masses were to be celebrated on the same day and the Sacrament were not to be reserved, then he would show less irreverence by taking than by reserving.

But Card. de Lug. d. 14 p. 4 n. 82. et Gran. non damnant Sacerdotem, qui prius quam sacras vestes exuit, pati culam inventam absumit, eo quod non sit Communio nova, sed complementum praecedentis. de Lugo, Escob. Articles Fifth. If a part of the host after the taken ablution adheres to the cup or palate (which is more decently removed by a new ablution than by being pushed away with a finger, as Bonaventure teaches from Filius and

others, although the presumed missal permits it to be drawn to the lip of the cup with a finger and taken before the ablution): in what manner are those excused who, out of devotion, retain the host in their mouths for a long time and thereby anticipate some ablution: yet this is not permitted spontaneously, unless good faith and holy simplicity excuse it. The reason for all this is because such a consumption morally considered is deemed the completion of one Sacrifice.

Reg. l. c. n. 123. Good. Chapter 1, Article 4, Question 6, Paragraph 2. They say also in number 6 at the end of page i, point 6ii: if on account of dryness he is unable to swallow it; but P. Zaccharia according to Croix relates that this was the custom of the Cluniac monks. Furthermore, it is licit to give a presumed healthy person an ablution of water or wine, so that he may be able to swallow particles and fragments which have adhered to his mouth, as Blessed XIV teaches in regard to the Sacrament.

Miss. l. 2 c. 22 utque pluribus in locis mos habet; eò quod, ut communiter docent Lugo d. 15 n. 79 et 83. Cross l. 6 p. i n. 573 et c. cum Ratio, quia violatio non censetur moraliter Communionem præcessisse; præceptum jejunii est ut ante Eucharistiae sumptionem nihil sumatur; quando autem una cum ablutione sumitur Eucharistia, tunc totum illud ex ablutione et particulis sumitur unica sumptione, unde bene verificatur violationem jejunii Communione non præcessisse. And therefore on a Wednesday the Church instituted a practice that the consecrated particle be consumed together with wine on the preceding day; and in the rubric. The Missal, l. 10 n. 8 says: if a particle adheres to the chalice, wine can be poured in and it can be taken; Lugo, n. 83, and Ex quibus omnibus, Lugo, d. n. 79, call the opinion of those who say that such a taking breaks the fast, a false belief. Cap. II. Doubt.

II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 125 niam. At least all concede that this fraction does not hinder fasting according to the Church's precept. "One case is when, out of fear of death, one can celebrate without an altar or a consecrated chalice, or sacred vestments, presumptuously not fasting," it teaches. 6 R. 48 et p. 5 t. 3 R. 39, provided that the celebration does not take place in contempt for Religion, the Church, or its precepts. » That after meals it may be celebrated with contempt for fear of death, more Doctors admit than that; besides, they concede that one is permitted to do so presumptuously. 4 art. 8 n. 9 v. IV.

Case: Et celebrare sine vestibus sacris, vel sine Altari, verius numquam est licitum, cum sit in- trinsece malum ob irreverentiam quae Sacrificio inferretur; (vide dicenda n. 377 dub. 2.) Neque ad dan-dum Viaticum, ut recte docent Bened. XIV. concerning the Sacrifice. Missa I. 3 c. 19 n. 6 et Lugo,

ac 6p. 1 n. 61o contra Jordan. You might ask: why is it permissible to celebrate Mass without fasting out of fear of death, and not permissible without sacred vestments? Without doubt, I have not found a response completely adequate to this difficulty; rather, it could be said that the Church has received the precept of celebrating with sacred vestments so rigorously that no dispensation is known to have been granted in any case; hence, vestments are considered as something intrinsic to the cult of such a great Sacrifice. However, the precept of fasting is not received so rigorously by the Church, since in many cases it permits communion without fasting, as stated in n. 284.

This last in accordance with truth, which states that if one has not slept after the meal or is not digested, regarding the precept of fasting, he can well communicate, as it is said in sect. 4, no. 350, and Bonac. p. 2 n. 11 cum. Fill. Henry and others commonly, against 363 n. 15. Otherwise, sometimes it is fitting to abstain from communion on account of mental torpor, as stated in book 126, chapter 2. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. Properly do Tournely say t. 5 p. 477 v. 3 and Conclna l.c. according to D. Thomas in question 80 article 8 ad 5 where he teaches thus: It makes no difference whether after having eaten or drunk, and having either slept or even already digested it, as regards the reason of the precept. But it matters concerning the disturbance of the mind which men suffer on account of insomnia or indigestion, from which if the mind is much disturbed, a man is rendered inept for the reception of this Sacrament. I nevertheless think that this does not proceed if wakefulness or indigestion arise from a natural or reasonable and honest cause; nor if man endeavors to repel that disturbance as much as he can, so as to approach devoutly, as we have said about him who has been subjected to pollution; see n: 272 at the end. ## ARTICULUS III. ## What is the obligation of receiving the Eucharist? 290 Is Communion necessary for adults by a medium necessity (See the presumptions stated in no. 192.) 291 When and under what circumstances must anyone be held to receive Communion if in danger of death? 292 What is to be done in case of vomiting, or in the case of delirium? 293 Should the Piaculum be administered to children?

See other notes at Busemb. 294 On the obligation to communicate. When does the Divine precept obligate, and when the Ecclesiastical? Doubtful. I. How is the year of obligation to be computed? 297 Dub. II. Whether the one who did not communicate in Easter is bound to communicate as soon as possible?

What if someone, anticipating an impediment and wishing to fulfill the

Paschal precept, anticipated the Communion? 298 Dub. III. Whether he who is unable to communicate at Easter is bound to anticipate? 299 Dub. IV. Whether the faithful are bound to remove an obstacle so as to satisfy for the Paschal Communion? 300 On the obligation of receiving communion in the parish.

Are it permissible for Foreign Priests to be excluded? Servants of Religion? Is there any other one by consent of the Pastor? Chapter II. Dub.

Two. On the subject of the Eucharist. 127 501 On the obligation of children to communicate at Easter. Qu. I. Whether children are to be held responsible or can immediately communicate after the use of reason?

Dub. 1. At what age are they considered obligated to receive Communion? Dub. 2. Is Communion to be given to infants at the point of death? 302 Qu. II.

Can communion be administered to the dead? 303 Qu. III. Concerning the Communicatio ad Semifatiis, Mutis, Surdis, et Obsessis? • Respondeo in primo. The consumption of the Eucharist by faithful adults is 200 [necessary] necessity not medium* (At vide dict.) 。 » n. 192), but obligatory by the command of Divine precept both in the article of death as a Viaticum, and presumptively useful in life, as teach Suar: Vasq. 13 c. 6; both from the practice of the Church, and because the Eucharist is instituted as food whose use is often necessary. ## Whence resolved.

> » 1. Each faithful person in danger of death is bound to do what he foresaw, either worthily or unworthily fearing; for instance, in a grievous illness, when attacked by fever, or after childbirth, especially the first one, before sailing, etc., he is held to communicate under mortal sin. Suaræ, Suaræ, vrasq, 214., 214. * (Idè . pag. 104 n. » 131. Antone pag. 481 q. 1 et et communi).* Nisi tamen paucis, v. gr. octo diebus, patè communicatum, talis enim communio censeretur habere rationem Viatici, ut docent contrà quosdam, ut diff. 2 etc. apud Escob., qui dicunt, eum, qui manè communicavit, si à prædio incurrat periculum vitæ, tenèri iterùm sumere Communionem, tamquam. imò. Sa, et Sydv. v.

Eyechar. Furnus etc and Caj. v. Communion, they think it is not very much of a mortal sin to omit, but rather when you have received communion at Paschate *. (See what was said in note 379 at the end of the page. Dictionary.) * » 2. If in a sick person there is danger from vomiting, Sancius teaches at 55 that it is possible to give him even a small stick which should not be thought to alter the stomach, or if doubt exists about

this for prudence's sake, first give a non-consecrated particle, so that if he rejects it, no consecrated one will in any way be given; but if he retains it.

If, however, it independently vomits apart from continuous food intake, under no circumstances is anything to be given, unless perhaps after six at least hours it has been free from vomiting. had been free from vomiting for at least six hours. In dubio, si sumens sit Particulam revomiturus, probabilius dicit Croix 1. 6p. i n. 552 cum aliis com- munius, non esse licitum communicare (contra . 554 cum Palao et Gob. However, nevertheless, well observed Croix. A particula potest descendere in stomachum: nam si tussis esset ita assidua ut id non permitteret, abstinentur ab Communione, ut habetur in Rom.

Roman. Confirm. infirmor. « 3. It is more probable that to children capable of doli, who know how to distinguish the Eucharist from other food, it should be given in the peril of death for Viaticum, as Vasquez insinuates in c. 4 and explicitly teaches, and this is confirmed by the 40th section of the Decretals and ratified by the Cardinals. » de Lugo d. 13 sect. 4 n. 38 cum si de capacitate pueri sit dubium, posse nihilominus dari, etsi non sit necesse cum Dian, et Possev. apud 4. Qui post sumptionem Viatici peccaverit mortaliter, non tenetur denuo communicare.

Thus Regina. Fill. Card. de Lugo, and others. *(Cum c. 8 n. 9 . » Table and Armilla according to «5. Who has not communicated in the danger of death, not.

"Is thereafter bound to supply." Thus Bonac. in the fourth question, seventh article, first part, from » Henry. Regular. etc. » » 6. The judge is bound, speaking per se, to grant the accused time to communicate, as commonly teach c. and others, to the contrary. If an answer were given to the accused that was not suitable for communication, see the aforementioned note 247 for further details.

Add to these, St. Pius V, as it is reported that he disapproved the custom of not administering the Eucharist to the condemned before their final supplication. » And it should be administered even presumptively if fasting is necessary. See the aforementioned n. 283. dub. 3 v. Here however.) * » Resp. 2. Even though Christ did not command at 294 "periculum mortis" a time for Communion: nevertheless the Church has determined a Paschal time for it, which is commonly counted from Palm Sunday, until.

» from Palm Sunday inclusive; nevertheless elsewhere. » The entire Lenten season is embraced; elsewhere it is extended by custom, or through indult,

and the penitentiary can extend it for just cause, as teach St. Augustine and others. V. Book 4, Question 7, Article 2. Wherefore it is resolved. 1.

This precept is fulfilled presumptuously through sacrilegious communion, as the common opinion holds, contrary to Durand and Sylv. And it is evident because the Church commands only the external act; nor does the end of the precept fall upon the precept. * (This, however, was condemned in what he said: Precepto 150. Book. VI. Treatise.

III. Concerning the Eucharist. The annual communion suffices through sacrilegious Lord's supper). * But as for him who does not suffice, it is held thereafter to be fulfilled, both positions being probably defended, although the affirmative appears more probable. Bonac. . c. Con. Card. de Lugo, etc. 2.

He is not bound to prevent beforehand who foresees, so that it be impediment at the time of Pasch, contrary to Vasquez. Sylv. et Fugund, probabiliter docet 17 r. 41. » l. 5 t. 4 cap. 5. quia non satisfecit praecepto obliganti ad Communionem, et ad illud tempus. He nevertheless denies it, citing Diana and Fernand. and Suarez. It is asked, at what time the faithful are bound to communicate?

Indeed, there are two kinds of precepts concerning this obligation: divine and ecclesiastical. The Divine precept will be found in that which is from John 6. Si carnem Filii hominis manducaveritis et sanguinem ejus bibetis, vita non habebitis in vobis. And from this precept we are bound to receive the Eucharist not only in time of danger of death, as Bus. says; but also presumptuously often in life, as commonly taught by 69 s. 1 and 3. Turn. to. 5 p. 359.

Escob. l. 20 n. 401. with Soto, Thomas III p. q. 80 art. 11. Reason, because it is fitting frequently to take earthly food in order to preserve corporeal life, so too heavenly food should be taken in order to preserve spiritual life. But rightly do they say with Lugo, Val. P. Soto says: However, Suárez states that this can happen very rarely, since other remedies suffice, such as prayers, penances, etc. In the case, however, where communion would be necessary, a man would not sin against that precept by omitting it, but against virtue, against which he suffers temptation. However, it is certain among all, what to this precept, per se speaking, Cap. II.

Dub. II. On the subject of the Eucharist. Each one may satisfy himself by communing once a year. The ecclesiastical precept is held from the Lateran Council IV. Licet enim esset olim obligatio communicandi saltem

ter in anno, nempe in Paschate, Pentecoste, et Natali Domini, ut statuit Fabianus Papa in canone 16 de Tamen ex praefato Con- cilio fideles hodie obligantur ad communicandum tantum semel in anno tempore Paschali, ut patet ex capitolo Omnis de Poenit. et remiss., ubi dicitur: Omnis utriusque sextis fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, saltem semel in anno confiteatur... suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha Eucharisticae Sacramentum; nisi forte de proprii Sacerdotis consisto ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejusmodi susceptione duxerit abstinendum; alioquin et vivens ab ingressu Ecclesiae arceatur, et moriens christland tureat sepultura.

This penalty, however, is incurred only after a sentence, as Palau says, p. i5 n. 14. q. 4 a. 3 n. 5., and others commonly gather from the cited text. Dubitatur i. How is this year of this annual Communion of oblation to be reckoned? Others hold that it should be computed from January to December, as Lugo states in d. 16 n. 69, and Palaus treats in tract. 23 p. 20 §. n. 10, with Vasquez. But according to the common doctrine and the received custom from everywhere, time is reckoned from Pasch to Pasch, because here it is deemed the ecclesiastical year.

Thus 36 s. 3 n. 8. 5 tr. 6 c. 5 n. 8. 4 R: i. Bon. d. 5 q. 5 p. 4 n. 19. cum . Sylv. et cum Sa, Fill. Reg. and others commonly. The Paschal time begins from the Palm Sunday, and ends on the Sunday of White, according to the Declaration of Eugene IV in the Bull, Fide Digna, in the year 1440.

However, by custom, necessity, or privilege, more time is conceded, as Tournai to tome 3 page 663 question 2. Lugo d. 16 n. 62. . 15 n. 2. n. 17. et 5. It is doubted II. Whoever has omitted the Communion at Easter is to be urged to communicate as soon as possible? There are three opinions.

The first opinion is more common, to which I subscribe, and which they hold. Sect. 70, lib. i, q. v. Therefore I say. Lugo, dated 16th day, note 65, page 310 verso. Prater, Tourney, tractatus tertius, pagina sextaetra tres, quaestio tercia. Edict. page 42.

Antopie. pag. 482 n. 8. . 3 p. 103 n. 127. cum Heno, cum 5 p. 1 n. 644. cum Aversa, etc., absolutely affirms, both from ecclesiastical precept, and divine. From divine precept, because although Christ did not determine this precept of Communion, He nevertheless left it to be determined by the Church, which subsequently determined that it should be observed at least once a year, as they say. 70 sect. i. in fine; Gonet loc. c. Bon q. 6 p. 3 n. 9. But moreover, Croix n. 599. Antoine p. 382 n. 8. et Ex praecepto ecclesiastico: tum quia tempus Paschae non est ab Ecclesia assignatum ad finiendam obligationem, sed ad eam sollicitandam: unde, quando obligatio

jam contracta nondum impleta est, quamprimum impleri debet; tum quia, ut dicunt Gonet pag. 310. Lugo d. 16 n. 65.

Tourney l. 3 p. 663 q. 3. etc. The Church has imposed two precepts regarding Communion: one to receive Communion once within a year, and another to receive Communion at Paschate, as is gathered from the cited chapter Omnis, and from canon 9 where it is said: If anyone shall have denied that faithful persons... should be held even annually at least in Paschate for receiving Communion according to the precept of the Holy Mother Church; let him be anathema. Note each year at least in Paschate; therefore, if Communion in Paschate was omitted, it ought to be fulfilled as soon as possible before the end of the year. Lugo however says n. 66, and that if anyone omits to communicate in Paschate, he does not sin each time. If he delays the Communion through an opportunity, but only if he omits Communion within a year; because then the precept of receiving Communion in Paschate cannot be observed any longer; hence only the obligation of another precept remains. Cap. II. Dub.

II. On the subject of the Eucharist. 135 Macandi: at least once a year. But more probably contradict 3: with: with Vasq. Aversa etc., quia, ut communiter dicunt Auctores hujus primae sententiae, hoc praeceptum communicandi in Paschate non est datum ad finiendam, sed: ad sollicitandam obligationem. The second opinion, which Arnillas and Fabiena uphold.

Others, and Renzi t. 2 pag. 547 qu. 3 distinguish; and he says that if anyone omits Communion out of malice, he is not bound to communicate immediately; because then he has already transgressed the precept affixed to the time of Paschaltide; but if he be hindered from doing so through impotence, he is bound, because then it is presumed that the Church consented to a delay, but did not wish to exempt the man from the obligation of Communion. The erroneous opinion absolutely denies being bound to receive Communion that year, one who omits it either out of malice or through inability; this is held by many grave doctors: as Sotus says in IV, d. 18, q. 1, a. 4. Sa v. 6 c. 18 n. 3. item Sylv. Val. ap. 4 R. 41. et probabilem putant cum Henriq. et S. Antoni: qui eam absolute docet p. 2 til. 9 c. 9 §. 3. ubi loquens de hoc casu, sic ait: Non vide- nartentari quod pater es similibus. The totality of the Church's fasting: who says that it is still bound to be supplemented elsewhere for God?

And the same applies to the violation of feasts, the omission of Mass, and other similar matters; for if it were true that necessity required them to be supplied until then, much would be committed in mortal sin by doing so, against one precept, and thus the Church would set snares for souls, which

she avoids. Cap. Vidas 27. As if: Reason for this sentence is, because the precept of Communion is affixed to a Paschal time, congruent with the precept of fasting; and hearing Mass is dedicated to watchfulness; and feasts are appointed for festal times. Whereas the congruity does not require fasting or hearing Mass or eating on the vigil day or feast day, neither is one bound to communicate after the lapse of the Paschal time. Unless (which is to be excused on account of counsel from the Confessor), they are silent: 3 and others commonly; for this has been expressly provided in c. Omnis, above cited. Authors of this opinion, however, deny that there are these two precepts: to communicate in the course of the year, and to communicate during Paschaltide; but they say that the Church imposed only one precept, attached to the time of Paschaltide, after which having passed, no obligation remains of communicating. They likewise deny that there exists a divine precept for communing once in a year; for although there is an obligation to commune frequently during one's life, they say that the precept for communing once in a year is merely ecclesiastical; no different from the precept of frequently worshiping God, which is presumed according to divine law, but the obligation to hear Mass on Sundays is only of ecclesiastical law, as they themselves carefully maintain in c. 1 n. 28 with Soto and Cajetan.

S. Anton. Axor. . Thom. 2. 2 q. 122 art. 4 ad. 4. ubi aut: Debe dicendum quod observantia diei Domini secundum novam legem succedere observationi Sabbati non ex vi praecepti legis, sed ex constitutione Ecclesiae et consuetudine populi christiani. See elsewhere stated 1. 3 n. 265. Among the doctors of the second opinion, none is found who adequately responds to this proposition; whence I do not consider this third opinion contemptible, at least because this obligation of communicating after the paschal time is constituted from neither divine nor ecclesiastical precept. Nevertheless, this being so, I do not wish to depart from the first sentiment.

But it is rightly not admitted by Lugo, d. 16, n. 77, num. a3, and Antoine, p. 286, n. 7: that intentio cannot effect such that an act set at a time when the obligation has not yet begun to take effect be satisfactorily efficacious; those who foresee that on the Lord’s day it will be hindered from fulfilling itself, by hearing Mass on the preceding day with the intention of satisfying the future obligation, certainly do not satisfy. This is confirmed from the Roman Ritual concerning the Eucharist, where it is said thus: Even to parochial infirmaries and those who may have received Communion outside the prescribed Paschal days, on the Paschal days the parish priest shall bring and minister that [Communion]. Dubitatur III. Quis an, qui non potest communicare temporibus Paschatis, tenetur id praevenire? The first opinion denies this, and this view is held by those in

section 70, paragraph 2, at the end, paragraph 57.

Busemb. ut supra num. 2. . Bon. d. 4 q. 6 p. 2 n. 15 cum Conincl. Fill. Reg. 149 q. 5 cum Ratio est eadem, quae adducta est a A. tertiae sententiæ in praecedenti quaestione, nempe quia hoc praeceptum addictum est tempori Paschali, quo non inceptum, nulla est obligatio. The second opinion: which is held by [author or party number] 5 n. 9. Lugo d. 16 n. 75.

Habert t. 5 p. 599 q. 5. Eibel t. 3 p. 103 n. 127. Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 642 et Antoine p. 483 n. 9. 22 et 5 dicit, quod si Communio non sit differenda ultra annum ab ultima facta, non tenetur praevenire, cum antecedens illa Communio non sit impletiva praecepti Paschalis, et eamdem obligationem relinquat. On the other hand, if it should be deferred beyond a year, then you would have to anticipate Communion, both because of the divine precept of communicating once in a year as determined by the Church; and also because of the precept of the Church itself, which imposes two obligations, namely, to communicate within a year, and to communicate at Easter, as has been stated above. If the obligation of communing at Paschate cannot be fulfilled, at least the obligation of communing once in a year must be fulfilled.

Hoc tamen secundum sententiam meam valde probabilior videtur; sed ad veritatem quae ipsa tantum procederet juxta opinionem illorum qui dicunt obligationem hujus annue Communionis incipere a Januario et terminari ad hoc dicendum videtur, nullam ei esse obligationem praeveniendi. Qui praevidet futurum ut non possit communicare tempore Paschali quia (ut bene advertit P. c.) talis Communio non esset ad impletiva praecepti; tempore quo fieret non adhuc inceptum esset tempus obligationis cum nondum inciperet tempus annuae Communionis. On the other hand, it is certain that, if at the beginning of the Paschal time one foresees himself as to be impeded from Communion, he must immediately receive it, as commonly taught, n. 25. Doubt is raised IV. Is it required to remove impediments so as to satisfy the precept of annual Communion? Commonly they say, Lugo, d. 16, n. 17.

Cross l. 6 p. 1 n. 626. Tamb: c. 4 § 4 n. 40. Salm de Dian p: 5 tr. 9 R 78. . 4 a. 2 nu. 10 cum; quia communio valde confert ad animae salutem, unde ipsius praeceptum rigide obligat ad auferenda mala spiritualia, quae obstant. They indeed hold that prisoners confined in a dungeon should not be held to seek liberty so as to communicate. But they more probably contradict 300 ' "Resp. 3.

Any person is bound to receive the Paschal Communion in his Parish from his Pastor, unless such permission, privilege, or custom exempts him.

Navarr. . 72 sect. 2 etc. * (Ex cap. Vide dicta n. 295.) * 1. Priest, wherever celebrating, satisfies. Good. d. 4 quæst. 7 p. 2. * (As commonly understood from custom, they say An- toine p. 482 n. 3 et etc., Understand, if he celebrates, otherwise he is bound to communicate in the parish, or else the laity.) * 2.

Excluded are the foreigners and the homeless who do not have a Parish and are absent from it. Bonac. l. c. * (And thus they are absent so that they cannot conveniently approach them. Neither then are they bound to communicate in the Mother Church of that city, nor in the Parish where they merely lodge while passing through, according to Sanchez de Matrim. » n. 17. See the aforementioned n. 240 v. 9.

If in "Paschate, and seq.) * 3. Laics inservientes Religiosis non eximuntur, ut habet S. Augustinus, cap. v. See d. 32 n. 12. * (See what has been said n. 240 v. 10. If they are.) * » 4. It does not suffice for this precept that one communicates outside the parish without the consent of the pastor during Paschaltide; as Navar. hold. Unless he communicates in the cathedral church: for Bonac. holds that this satisfies the precept, but Card. de Lugo denies it, unless the Bishop expressly or tacitly consents. * (But I do not know whether the opinion of Bona is probably true, unless there be some common usage which presumes the consent of the Bishop; for sheep ought to be known by their own shepherd.) * See above c. 2 d. 2 art. 1 c. 2 et 6, 1 art. 1 cas. 7, 8 et 9.

I have spoken without the consent of the Pastor: for because of the consent of the Supreme Pontiff, or Bishop, or Ordinary, or his General Vicar, or Parish Priest (for all these are understood by the name of Pastor), in communicating outside the parish area, the Doctors concede that this satisfies the precept. And indeed a sufficient interpretative or presumed consent, * (Provided there be certainty of moral will on part of the parishioner, so that)* it notes c. 4 § 4. However, Bon. in theol. mor. p. 1, t. 5 q. 19. Beja, and some others according to c. et de Lugo d. 18 s. 2 n. 49. They also think that it is possible to satisfy the precept of the Paschal Communion (especially outside the day of Passover). 138.

Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. a. according to the Mendicants by privilege of Nicholas V.

VII. and by Paulus IV. confirmed what other communicants have. But this is commonly denied by others. V. When Diana, as above Beja understands, 1. 20 n. 441., faithful ones satisfy the precept by communicating in Regular Churches, using the privileges granted to the aforementioned Monasteries by the Pontiffs D.Hieronymi.

But commonly and justly they reproach this, Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 631 et; thus presumptuous . 3 n. 6. Bon. d. 4 p. 1 n. 12 et cum an. 1486 apud Nec obstant praefata Privilegia (quorum meminit Busemb.) nam ut ajunt AA. citati, cum Pontifices sape declarant, quod Communionem obligatorium semper servandum esse illud ius Parochorum, tam praedicta Monasteria D. Hieronymi quam aliae Religiones numquam illis Privilegiis usae sunt nisi pro suis familiaribus. Whereupon Escob. 1. c. holds that an opposite opinion is not practice-probable; and truly our sentiment seems to be approved by common custom. Boys baptized who are impotent for reason, and perpetually insane, perceive a true increase of grace by receiving the Eucharist; because it suffices to receive this sacrament in the state of grace, to perceive its effect. Thus 8o article 8.

Catechism and Roman Ritual concerning the Eucharist. But it is asked I. Whether children immediately and have use of Chapter II. Doubt. II.

Concerning the subject of the Eucharist. Whether reason can and should communicate? The first opinion affirms this, and such is held by S. 12 where he says: When (the boy) is capable of mortal sin, then he is obligated to the precept of Confession, and consequently of Communion, which are given together. The same is said by Sanctius d. 26 et l. 20 n. 243, and Diana p. 3 tract. 6 R. 70 considers it probable with Tab. Reason why, because such children already being capable of committing mortal sin and disposing themselves to absolution through due sorrow, they become presumptuously capable of receiving Communion, to which greater requirement is made of prudence of reason. The second, however, commonly held and more probable opinion denies this, and those who teach this say: 70 s. 1 a.

But lest it be repugnant, Antoine, p. 491 v. Children, Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 646. cum Vasq. Soto. c. Cum et quamvis sint obligati ad Confessionem, non tamen sunt tenaci ad suscipiendam Eucharistiam, quae est excellentiae magioris, et non tam necessitatis. Nor does it hinder the chapter Omnis 12 de pani, which states that every faithful person, after reaching the age of discretion, is bound not only to confession but also presumptively to communion; for the years of discretion are understood respectively with regard to the nature of the matter: namely, when one has reached the years of discretion for confession, he should confess, and when one has reached the years of discretion for communion, he should communicate. But it should be noted that among the supporters of this opinion, there are others like Vasq.

Hurr. n. 242 censeant tales pueros nec tenendi nec posse communicare

quia ut dicat Eucharistia non potest dari eis qui non sunt capaces ad dignè communicandum. Others, however, as Deinde, 138. Lib. VI. Treatise.

III. On the Eucharist. a. according to the Mendicants by privilege of Nicholas V. VII. and by Paulus IV. confirmed what other communicants have. But this is commonly denied by others.

V. When Diana, as above Beja understands, 1. 20 n. 441., faithful ones satisfy the precept by communicating in Regular Churches, they do so through the privileges granted to the aforementioned Monasteries of D.Hieronymi by the said Pontiffs. But commonly and justly they reproach this, Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 631 et; thus presumptuous . 3 n. 6. Bon. d. 4 p. 1 n. 12 et cum anno 1486 apud Nec. obstante praefata Privilegia (quorum meminit Busemb.) nam ut ajunt AA. citati, cum Pontifices sape declararent, quod Communio obligatoria semper servanda esse illud ius Parochorum tam praedicta Monasteria D. Hieronymi quam aliae Religiones numquam illis Privilegiis usae sunt nisi pro suis familiaribus. Whereupon Escob. 1. c. opines that an opposite opinion is not practice-probable; and truly our sentiment seems to be approved by common custom.

Boys baptized who are deprived of reason and are perpetually mute, by receiving the Eucharist truly perceive an increase of grace; for it suffices to receive this Sacrament in a state of grace to perceive its effect. Thus 8o article 8. Catechism and Roman Ritual concerning the Eucharist. But it is asked, I. Whether children immediately and have use of Chapter II.

Doubt. II. Concerning the subject of the Eucharist: whether and why they can and should communicate? The first proposition affirms this, and this is held by S. 12 where it says: When (the boy) is capable of deceit, that is to say when he can mortalily sin, then he is bound by the precept of Confession, and consequently of Communion, which are given together. The same is said by Sanctius in d. 26 and l. 20 n. 243. Diana also considers it probable in tract. 6 R. 70. cum Tab.

Reason why, because such children already being capable of committing mortal sin and disposing themselves to absolution through due sorrow, they are deemed presumptuously capable of receiving Communion, to which less is required in terms of rational discretion. The second opinion, however, which is most common and more probable, denies this, and those who teach this say so in 70 s. 1 p. But it is to be rejected, Antoine says on page 491 v. Children, according to Croix, l. 6, p. 2, n. 646, with Vasquez. Soto, c. cum Et quamvis obligentur ad Confessionem, non ideo tenentur suscipere Eucharistiam, quae est majoris excellentiae et non tante necessitatis. Nor does it hinder the chapter Omnis 12 de panni, which

states that every faithful person, after reaching the age of discretion, is bound not only to confession but also presumptively to communion; for the years of discretion are understood respectively according to the material reason: namely, when one has reached the years of discretion for confession, he should confess, and when for communion, he should communicate.

But it should be noted that among the supporters of this opinion, there are others like Vasq. Hurr. n. 242 hold that such boys should neither be considered as infants nor capable of receiving Communion, because (as it is said) the Eucharist cannot be given to those who are not capable of receiving it worthily. Others, however, as Deinde, with Soto, and ad Croix l.c., consider it more probable that, although children are not bound to communicate immediately after acquiring the use of reason, they nevertheless are not prohibited from approaching the Eucharist so that they may always and learn to discern this heavenly food from the profane; for then, as D. 80, art. 9 ad 3 says: When children begin to have some use of reason, so that they can conceive devotion to this Sacrament, it can be conferred upon them. That is confirmed in the last chapter. Cas, 26 quæst. 6 ubi dicitur: Cui paenitentia non negatur, nec reconciliatio denegunda est.

But here there is doubt: When are children considered obligated to communicate? Soto in II. cc. sententia est, hanc obligationem incipere a 12 anno; quia (ut ajunt) in ea aetate pueri tenentur ad leges ecclesiasticas. But this is commonly rejected, as we have said regarding the Law. I. 1 n. 155. Hence commonly they say that, speaking regularly, boys are not obliged to Communion before the ninth or tenth year; nor is their Communion to be deferred for them beyond the twelfth year; as they sense in n. 18 with Lugo, Antoine and Croix II. cc. Thereupon it should be noted what S. Charles Borromeo has prescribed (in Synod.

Diocese. IX.) Parochi illos qui decennium attigerint acrescunt, instruunt ad cognitionem Eucharistiae, doceantque quomodo reverenter ad eam accedant. It has been rightly said, for as the Authors observe, children can more easily be bound by an obligation who are perceived to be more perspicacious before such an age. Whereby rightly reprimands Regulation 5. Parochos, qui indiscriminatim non admittunt ad Communionem, misi pueros in certa aetate cohaerentes.

They say, however, in no. 646, that although children as young as ten years old can be admitted to Communion, nevertheless they are not bound by that at that time, but only when they have been advised by the parish priest or his assistants. It shall be given. 2. Communionem in periculo mortis tribuatur. Cap. II. Dub. II.

On the subject of the Eucharist. May wholesome food be given to boys who are capable of reason? The response should be negative, because there is the same danger of irreverence present, and because such is the usage of the Roman Church. Thus commonly S. Th. loc. cit. likewise Caj... 7 n. 7. And whoever should act otherwise would gravely sin, as noted in Psalms ibid., n. 8 with Led: who says that such universal use of the Church is equivalent to a prohibition. But as regards children who are already of sound reason, it is said that Communion may be given to them after they are in the article of death, as stated among others by Wigand in his treatise 12 n. 46. And it should also be done, as commonly taught by 1.

Lugo distinguishes in the thirteenth distinction, number thirty-seven. Laicus: caput 4 num. 3. I said two. Anthony p. 581. Escob. l. 20 n. 244 et idem docet Bened.

XIV. from the Council. Book 7, Chapter 12, note 3. Reason, because on one side children in such a danger are constituted to communicate from a divine precept; on another side the utility of the Eucharist does not then demand greater disposition. Question II. Is communion to be ministered to them amen-302? Absolutely must it be denied to the insane, as all say according to St. de Euch., where it is said: To the insane or frenzied ones communication is not permitted; yet it will be permissible if at any time they have intervals of lucidity and devotion, while remaining in that state; provided no risk of indecency arise therefrom. Gobatus however considers that to others who have not always lacked the use of reason, but now lack it, communion should be given absolutely in case of danger of death. t. 4 n. 135.

But in this, the doctrine of D. must be followed, who says thus: If previously, when they were composes of their minds, devotion to this Sacrament appeared in them, it should be given to them at the point of death this Sacrament, unless fear is felt of danger of vomiting or expulsion. Of this Sacrament, it should be given to them at the point of death this Sacrament, unless fear is felt of danger of vomiting or expulsion: Likewise he almost taught the Catechism saying; Moreover to the insane, because then they are alienated from the sense of piety, Sacraments should scarcely be given; although if before they fell into madness, they have brought about a pious will for themselves, it shall be allowed to them at the end of life according to the Decree of the Council of Carthage to administer Eucharist, provided that no danger of vomiting or other indignity and inconvenience is feared. Hence it is sufficient that such a sick person have lived in piety, as rightly stated on page 345, note 46, and by Bonac. Reason, because on one side it is presumed that he seeks to receive

Communion, while on another this Eucharist may still be necessary for him, namely if he had fallen into amendment being in a state of mortal sin, of which he has been only attrit: Nevertheless, the Doctors ibid. n. 11 presume such a person to have certainly fallen into amendment completely penitent. Outside the article of death, in no way is the Eucharist to be conceded to those who have committed an amen, as stated in n. 11 with cum and communi. 33 Quæritur III. When the Eucharist is to be conceded to semifools, mute persons, and those in a state of obsession.

It is replied that to semifools the celestial food should always and knowingly be distinguished from other foods; only in the article of death, and at the time of the precept, Communion should be given. Thus according to 12 n. 37. and when (contrary to those who allow it every time). The same rule applies to Mutis and Surdis from birth, provided that their discretion is established by signs; then indeed rightly he says that if these are not deprived of any kind of discretion, they can often receive Communion. But to the mute, deaf, and blind from the time of their birth, Communion is altogether denied; whereas in the case of epileptics, Communion is denied only during a seizure, as Eibel says, n. 98. The same rule applies to those possessed by a demon when they are not in their right mind. Cæteris cum et aliis, ex doctrina S. 80 a. 9 ad 2 rectè ajunt, Eucharistiam pluries in anno, juxta prudentiam Confessarii, istis concedendam esse, cum sit specialis re Cap. III.

Dub. I. Cum et aliis, ex doctrina S. 80 a. 9 ad 2 rectè ajunt, Eucharistiam pluries in anno, juxta prudentiam Confessarii, istis concedendam esse, cum sit specialis re- Cap. III. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 143 medium for driving away demons; hence Cassian says (ap. D. Thom. l. c.): For those who are harassed by unclean spirits, we have never considered the Communion from the Senior priests to be absolutely forbidden. ## CAPUT III. ON THE EUCHARIST, AS IT IS SACRIFICE. ## DOUBT I. ## What is the Mass, and what obligation do the Priests have concerning it? Definition of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Not. I. Do I object to the definition of a sacrifice in general? Not. II.

How are sacrifices distinguished from one another? And how does the sacrifice of the Eucharist contain all of them? And in what way does it differ from the sacrifice of the Cross? Not. III. Is the Mass truly a Sacrifice? In what consists the essence of the Sacrificial Mass? Is it necessary for the essence of the Sacrifice that both species be consecrated? Who are the offerers in the Sacrificial Mass? For whose sake can Mass be offered? Dubium 1. Whether a Mass can be offered for the sake of Excommunicates?

Dub. 2. Concerning the faithless? Doubtful 3io, Question 3. For the dead? The effects of the sacrifice of the Mass are four. I. Remission of sins?

II. Remission of penalties. III. Increase of grace. IV.

The petition for goods. IIII. On the value, and fruit of the Mass. Does the Mass have an infinite value? And whether the fruit of the Mass depends on the integrity of the Celebrant? 3i3 De obligatione celebrandi, quam habent Sacerdotes. Dub. 1. Do they at any time hold themselves bound by the grave precept to celebrate [Mass]?

Dub. 2. How often are simple priests bound to celebrate on each occasion throughout the year? How often are Parish Priests? And how often are Bishops obliged?

3i4 Concerning the daily celebration of a conventual Mass. 3i5 Regarding the obligation to say Mass at due time for accepted stipend. 3i6 What is to be noted around the origin of the stipend? Lib. VI.

Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist. Qu. I.

May it be permitted to a priest receive payment for Masses? And whether he sins gravely who principally celebrates Mass for a stipend? Yes. II. How does a priest sin by deferring the celebration?

And what is deemed a moderate delay? What if the Mass is handed over to the Community? What. III. Whether a priest sins gravely by omitting the sacred promise for a small reward?

Qu. IV. What, if the Mass is gratuitously promised? May a stipend be received for the application of the most special fruit? And whether it is permissible to receive more than one stipend for one Mass?

From whom, and how is the stipend to be taxed? Dnb. 1. Whether Regulars are bound to observe the tax imposed by the Bishop? Dub. 2. May a Bishop prohibit the reception of a greater stipend than the tax?

Dub. 3. Is it permissible to prohibit that a lesser stipend be received? But he who has received less, can he diminish the number of Masses? Dub. 4. May peace be given as a stipend?

Dub. 5. How is the stipend of the Masses to be taxed, which the testator

left behind? It is not permissible to celebrate [the Mass] through another, retaining part of the stipend. Exception I. If the wage is given with regard to the person.

Exception II. If another Priest truly and spontaneously grants a portion. It is excepted III. Beneficiarius, Capellanus, et Sacerdos obligati ex legato sibi relicto sub vita sua during? Dub. 1.

Quis, qui partem stipendi sui retinet, tenetur ad restitutionem? And to whom is restitution due? Dub. 2. what concerning the Procurator or Executor of a will? Dub. 3. Can the overseer of alms retain a portion for his labor?

Dub. 4. Can the Mass of greater stipend be commuted with Masses of lesser stipend? Dub. 5. Can administrators of churches retain anything for expenses? On the obligation of Beneficiaries and Parishes applying Masses.

Qu. I. To whom should Masses be applied by Benefactors, and by Chaplains of Nuns, or of Confraternities? What if the foundation of the Benefice or Capellany should be unfruitful? What.

II. On what days are parish priests bound to celebrate Mass for the people? See what is sanctioned by Benedict. XIV. upon the Mass of the Parishes. On the Convention Mass.

On the obligation of celebrating Votive Masses; on the obligation of celebrating Masses with promises under stipend. with promises under stipend. Of the obligation to celebrate in the designated place and time according to Chapter III. Doubt. I. Of the Eucharist,, as it is, a Sacrifice. What, if the Bishop dispenses?

And whether a prescription can dispense from the obligation of celebrating Masses? [530] Concerning the obligation of the beneficiary to celebrate prescribed Masses and to celebrate by himself. [551] Concerning the reduction of Masses. Can an Episcopos perform that? And can the offices be moderated and alms attached to anniversary celebrations? Can a Beneficiarius sometimes celebrate Mass for his own relatives or friends, or omit Mass out of reverence? Must a Capellanus, when attending to an invalid, have someone else satisfy the Masses? Of three. Gregorian masses.

Is it permissible to receive a stipend for the first Mass which the newly ordained priest celebrates with the Bishop? (But perhaps). R. Response. Mass is a sacrifice consisting in the creation of bread and wine; that is to

say, an act of latria, performed in recognition of the supreme dominion of God, and a sign of our servitude. That does not prevent the second offering being presumed for another partial end, such as to render thanks or implore a benefit, for the remission of sins, to honor the Saints, etc. It should be noted that in general, the Sacrifice is an oblation made through the alteration of some thing, as a sign of supreme dominion, by legitimate institution. Ita communiter. Offered to God, because sacrifice is offered only to God, not to saints.

By the alteration of some thing, an alteration indeed distinguishing the sacrifice from other offerings, as a sign above the dominion, for by such a sign we signify that we and our possessions can be destroyed just as the offered thing is altered. By legitimate institution: this inquiry requires three things that a sacrifice may be made: public authority, that it be done in the name of the whole people, and that it be performed by the priest as a legitimate minister. It is to be noted that the sacrifice is divided in part by matter, form, and end. According to the part of Matter, it is distinguished into Victim, or Hostia, wherein something animated offers: Sacrifice, in which something inanimate but solid is offered: Oblation, in which something liquid is offered. According to the aspect of Form, it is distinguished into Holocaust, in which the whole, which is offered, is consumed by fire: Sacrifice for sin, in which that which is offered is partly consumed by fire, partly by the priest: Peace offering, in which that which is offered is partly consumed by fire, partly by the priest, partly by him who gives.

According to the part of the end, it is distinguished in Latreuticum, which is offered merely in obedience to God: Eucharisticum in thanksgiving: Propitulatorium, or Expiatorium for the remission of guilt or penalty: Impetratorium for obtaining good things from God. Sacrificium autem Eucharistiae in lege gratie institutum (quo omnia antiqua sacrificia cessarunt) omnium rationes illorum perfecte continet: Est enim holocaustum in recognitionem divinae excellentiae; est eucharisticum in gratiarum actionem; est impetratorium gratiarum per merita Christi; et expiatorium peccatorum, quia per illud Deus ad misericordiam movetur, estque missae sacrificium incruentum idem profecto ac sacrificium cruentum crucis, non solum quia eadem persona offeritur, sed praesumptum quia eadem est formalis ratio sacrificii, cum offeratur in protestationem summus domini, quod habet Dei vitae et mortis. Therefore the sacrifice of the altar, as Triduntes says, does not indeed differ essentially from the sacrifice of the Cross, but only accidentally in respect to the manner of offering, namely because 1. In illo Crucis intercessit mors realis, in hoc intervenit mystica. That was offered through the very Redeemer on the altar of the Cross, this is offered by the ministerial

priesthood.

That was a merit, because there the price of our redemption was remitted; but this is not a merit, since here only the merits of Christ are applied. III. Notandum certum esse et de fide, quod Missa sit vere et proprie sacrificium et a Christo institutum quantum ad id quod pertinet ad essentiam sacrificii: per consecrationem enim et per assumptionem, per consecrationem enim et per assumptionem, à infra Cap. III. Dub. I. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice, 147 will say that Christ is mystically slain, and thus the transformation is held to be required for the sacrifice.

Therefore according to Et Can. 1. 3 and 4. Question Nonehere I. In what consists the essence of the Sacrifice of Mass? This is a great question among the Doctors. For there are many differing opinions.

The first opinion states that it consists solely in the mere taking; because in that alone is found the destruction or alteration of the victim; and thus they hold: Pignatelli in his Propletorio, and Alb. Magnus, 3 p. d. 74 s. 5 in principio. The second opinion says that it consists in the offering, since the Sacrifice is nothing other than an offering; thus according to 10 c. 19 and Sot. and 1 n. 142, and 6 p. 2 n. 12. The third opinion is more common, teaching that it consists solely in consecration, and thus they hold . 75 sect. 6. Gonet Man. to. 6 p 331. 7 p. 414 concl. 6.

Petroc. to. 3 p. 496. Habert to. 5 p. 642. Response 3. Juvenin to. 7 p. 366 concl. 4. Frassen. to. 11 p. 352.

Conc. to. 8 p. 424 n. 6. Cross chapter 6 page 2 number 13. and with St. Anthony. Lug. Reason, because in consecration all things are required for the Sacrifice, namely the oblation, which is already performed in the act of offering, just as Christ also offered Himself to God the Father both at the supper and on the cross not by words but by deed: there is present the presumed destruction or alteration of the victim, when through the word the body is now separated from the blood of Christ. This opinion is indeed very probable and more common, but in my view the fourth opinion (although I adhere to the third) seems more probable, which Bellarmine holds in his second work, eighth tome, page 371.

Soto. in IV de Decimo, quaestio 1. Bonac. d. 4 q. ult. p. 2 et alii apud Dicast. This judgment states that the essence of the Eucharist consists partially in the consecration and partially in the consumption; for in the consecration the victim is placed, and in the consumption it is consumed.

Ralio I quia verum et reale Sacrificium veram requirit et realem destructionem rei oblatae, qua non habetur, nisi per sumptionem Sacerdotis, qui destruitur sacramentalis essentia Christi. Nor does it hinder to say that in the consecration there is already contained the mystical death, and in this measure there is not real death, because on account of the natural concomitance neither can be separated from the blood of Christ and His soul from the body.

For it is answered that if that natural concomitance impedes death, the presumption impedies the Sacrifice, which without true and real destruction is not consummated; Ratio 2. because, if destruction did not occur through assumption, it would follow that the Sacrifice would be made in heaven, not on the altar; for in order that the Sacrifice be made on the altar, it is necessary that first the victim be placed intact there, and then destroyed. When however in consecration bread by virtue of the words comes to have only the body separated from the blood: it follows that destruction is presupposed as already accomplished in heaven, where Christ remains whole and entire. Nor is it to be understood that, although by virtue of the words alone the body is separated from the blood, yet on account of the concomitant reason Christ remains whole, and consequently is mystically destroyed. Nam respondetur quod hoc esset per accidens non per se; sed cum Sacrificium (ut supponunt Auctores tertiae sententiae) fiat per se vi verborum, ratione separationis sanguinis a corpore, necesse est ut praesumptum per se vi verborum ponatur integer Christus prius quam destruatur. Moreover, their adversaries say that the oblation, although it does not regard the essence of the Sacrifice, nevertheless regards its integrity, so that the Priest may partake of the thing offered.

Therefore, the rubric of the Missal (lit. 10 a. 3.) thus warns: If the priest seriously falls ill or dies after the consecration of the body but before the consecration of the blood, or even if both have been consecrated, the Mass shall be completed by another priest at that place where he is absent; and in a case of necessity, the presumed offering through non-fasting shall suffice. And the same is taught by S. 6 ad 1 ex. Council. To-let VII. in capite Nihil, causae VII., quaestio I. Sixth question.

It is asked II. Whether the essence of the Sacrifice requires the consecration of both species. The first opinion denies what is held on page five, paragraph one hundred and twenty-four, along with the last question at page two, note seven, along with Henry. It is grievous. Nunno et alia considerate probabilem putant Caput III.

Dub. I. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 14g Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 15. Reason, also because through the very consecration of one species the

whole Christ is placed and offered, and at the same time already represents the death of Christ, when by the words alone the body without blood, or the blood without body, is designated which signifies the death of Christ; also because, as others say, in the consecration and consumption of one species there already exists the offering and slaying of the victim, which is sufficient for the essence of the Sacrifice. The second opinion is more common and probable, and supports this conclusion, saying 75 s. 6 v.

I say: Tom. in Lugo de Euch. d. 19 ex n. 106. cum communi ut asserit, tit. p. 2 n. 6. et favet D. 12 ad 3 ubi dicit: Representatio Dominica Passionis agitur in ipsa consecratio,... in qua non debet corpus sine sanguine conserare. The reason is that the Sacrament of the altar ought to be commemorative of the bloody Sacrifice accomplished by Christ on the Cross, as declared in chapter 22, where it teaches that Christ offered His body and blood under the species of bread and wine, so that... He might leave a visible sacrifice for His Church, whereby (note) that bloody Sacrifice once performed on the Cross would be represented. Wherefore if only one species were consecrated, even though by the words of institution the body might be placed in a state of being without blood, or through participation might be considered as slain, yet nevertheless the expression of the effusion of blood would not be made known; for this is effected only through the consecration of both species, by which properly is signified the separation of the blood from the body, according to the saying of St. Cyril: By the word of institution the blood is separated from the body. Here however one must advert to this, which is contained in the Rubrica Missalis (tit. 4 n. 8): If the matter which should be added were on account of defect neither bread nor wine could otherwise be had; if that is before consecration of the body, further proceeding should not be made; if after consecration of the body, and a defect in one species is found, the other already consecrated; then if it cannot in any way be had, proceeding will be made and the Mass absolved, but so as to omit the words and signs which pertain to the deficient species. That is, if for a long time it is expected to be able to have something held—Lib.

VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist: it will be expected that the sacrifice does not remain imperfect. Hereupon Gavantus notes at chapter 10, canon 35, question 6, that if it can be most difficultly held that the species may fail, and thereby a notable offense arise to the people, the Mass should be declared absolved, because the natural right of avoiding scandal prevails over the divine positive law of completing the Sacrifice. It is moreover of faith that Christ the Lord is the principal Priest offering in the Sacrifice of the Mass, as commonly Doctors with Saintly session 22 chapter 2 state.

After Christ, ministers of this sacrifice are priests who alone have the power to consecrate and offer the body and blood of Christ; they consecrate even if they are heretics, degraded, etc., according to 23 c. 1. The entire Church declares a presumptuous offering of the sacrifice through the priest, as many say according to Croix n. 19. After priests, all faithful ones offer the sacrifice mediately through the hands of priests, in three and each of these ways. I. Post Sacerdotes, omnes fideles offerunt Sacrificium mediately per manus Sacerdotum, tribusque uique modis. In a general manner, namely through the priests, who, by offering the Sacrifice as public ministers, are said to presume to offer it for any faithful person. II.

More specifically, in a particular sense, by endeavoring, as priests celebrate for themselves. III. By assisting at the Sacrifice. It is certainly presumed that this Sacrifice can be offered for all baptized faithful, both the living, and for infants supposed to be alive, or for energumens, or for sinners not excommunicated, which fruit consists solely in impetration: according to c. 2 de Sent. Excommuniciatis. To avoid offering the Sacrifice to an excommunicate person, however, a legitimate Priest has the power to celebrate Mass privately, as it is an act proper to his private person, and not in the name of the Church, nor as minister of Christ: Although if he were to offer it as minister of Christ, it would be valid, but illicitly offered; see Croix n. 33. With regard to 309, however, there is doubt whether a legitimate Priest can lawfully pray or offer Mass in the name of the Church, or as minister of Christ for an excommunicate person tolerated: Some deny this, citing c. 2 n. 19.

Because the Church, they say, excludes excommunicated individuals entirely from participation in suffrages; for the Council of Constantinople, Chapter III. Doubt. I. Quia Ecclesia dicit excludere omnes excommunicatos ab omnino communicatione suffragiorum; Conciliumque Constantiense, Cap. III. Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice: 151 in order to avoid nothing being granted to themselves, he merely provided favor to others, so that they might be able to communicate with those who had been tolerated after being excommunicated. But the opposite opinion is more probable, which Lugo holds in dispute 19, note 187.

Croix n. 34. when there is doubt whether Mass can be offered for infidels? They deny c. 2 n. 18. Nam efficiens effectus sacrificii, ut dicunt, non est communicandus his, quibus sacramenta non possunt communicari. They nonetheless more probingly assert this, Lugo d. n. 173., and Bellarm. 19. Then because in the old law the Jews were accustomed to sacrifice for the Gentiles, as in 1 Macc. ch. 12 for the Spartans, where: We are mindful of your sacrifices which we offer.

Since thus celebrating one is more conformed to Christ, who offered himself for all. For those who are dead but exist in Purgatory, it is fitting that Mass be offered lawfully and profitably, as teaches 22 c. 2 where it is said that the Sacrifice of Mass is not offered for the sins, penalties, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful living only, but also for the dead... it is rightly offered according to the tradition of the Apostles. And again in Can. 3 it is held: If anyone says that the Sacrifice of the Mass... should benefit only the living, and neither for the dead, nor for sins, etc., let him be anathema. You will ask whether the Mass profits the dead according to the infallible promise of Christ? Canus, Sotus, et Corduba negant.

But more truly and commonly they affirm (79 s. 10 et ipsi); Fug. 26. v. 28); Hic est san-152..... Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

You, my new testament, who for the better shall be poured out (in the Greek text it is read as shall be poured out) for the remission of sins. It is confirmed from the words in which the form is ordained for the Presbyters: Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses both for the living and for the dead in the name of the Lord. Amen. You will ask: whether the Mass for the Dead profits the dead more than the Mass for the Saints? Saint Thomas responds saying: From the standpoint of the offering of the sacrifice, it is equally beneficial to the dead person for whomsoever it may be said; but from the standpoint of the prayers, it is more beneficial in those where prayers are determinedly addressed to this purpose; yet this defect can be compensated by greater devotion on the part of him who celebrates Mass, or of him who has it celebrated, or repeatedly through the intercession of the Saint whose suffrage is invoked in the Mass.

Of the effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass. 1. The effect is the remission of sins: concerning which it is asked whether this Sacrifice remits mortal sins immediately in a man who has been attrito, as an imitation of the Sacrament of Penance? Cassalius affirms it on the second day of the week. Masses, but the contrary must be held, namely that Mass does not have the power to remit mortal sins immediately by itself, but only to implore assistance for penance, which will remit them, as commonly taught by Bellarmine d. 2 de t. 8 p. 484. . 79 s. 3 et 4. and with ... and others frequently, from ... where he says that the Mass removes mortal sins not because of a proximate cause, but inasmuch as it obtains contrition of grace. And it is proven from the Tridentine Council, session 22, chapter 2, where it is said: By this (sacrifice) the Lord is placated, and through this

offering He grants grace and the gift of penance, forgiving great crimes and sins presumptuously committed.

Therefore God is immediately placated through this Sacrifice, and thereafter moved to grant the gift of penance, by which immediate removal of sins is effected. It is confirmed by reason, because the Sacrifice of Mass is offered by Christ the Supreme Priest, who cannot, however, suffice, since it is stated in Chapter III. Dub. I. Confirmatur ratione, quia Sacrificium Missæ offertur à Christo Summo Sa- cerdote, qui nuno non potest satisfacere, cum non Cap. III. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 153 Let the wayfarer be, and therefore not merit but merely himself interpellating beseech us for us, grants us thanks.

Likewise should it be said concerning venial sins as St. Thomas has discussed in the aforementioned question, article 1 and article 2 of the same chapter (contrary to Canons and Valorantium, who hold that venial sins are remitted by virtue of the Sacrifice itself), because since venial sins are certain stains of the soul, contracted through one's own will, they are not removed without a pious action of the mind which is repugnant to those very venial sins. II. The effect of this Sacrifice is per se immediately to remit the punishments of sins to just men for whom it is offered; thus commonly [said] 79 s. 6. Assertio prima. Wigancl. tr. 12 n. 81 R. 4. et cum . 5. ubi ait quod hoc Sacramentum, in quantum est Sacrificium, habet vim satisfactivam.

And it is evident from chapter 25, where it would be said: Souls detained in Purgatory are most especially aided by the suffrages of the faithful; but rather by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar to be made for them. Another way by which the dead cannot be helped is through immediate remission of penalties. II. The effect is an increase in grace. Regarding which it is sought, whether the Mass sacrifice itself by its very work and operation confers this increase?

Affirmant Leandr. Card. et Mach. But it must be denied with Article 79, Section 4, and those who cite Vasquez. Therefore more accurately it should be said that through the Mass assistance is sought for acts by means of which grace is increased. IV.

The effect is the petition for spiritual goods and presumptuous temporal ones, so that these may profit the souls, according to the saying: "The principal fruit of the Mass from the work wrought is independent both from the worthiness of the Priest by whom it is offered, for all—whether living or dead—whoever accept the recompense, can apply it, and it is at once intensely and extensively finite; although the Host itself, and the

principal offerer, that is to say Christ, infinitely are grateful to God, so that God thereby be infinitely honored by this Sacrifice, yet it seems that the will of Christ is such that it should be offered and profit only for a certain and finite effect." Which is evident from the use and sense of the Church, since the Mass is repeated for the same purpose: which is a sign that it does not have an infinite effect. V. Quod praesumptum patet ex usu, et sensu Ecclesiae, dum Missae pro eadem re repetuntur: quod signum est, non habere infinitum effectum. Bonac. d. 4 q. ult. p. 4. It must be noted that there is one value and another fruit of the Mass.

Value is that efficacy which the Mass possesses by reason of the dignity of the offerer and of the thing offered, for conferring good things upon the offerer, and upon those for whom it is offered. The fruits are the goods themselves which God confers in view of the Sacrifice. Wherefore value is distinct from fruit, as cause from effect. Notandum duo. The fruit of the Mass is distinguished in three respects; for it is distinguished 1. with regard to the cause, that is, with regard to the work performed and the worker.

The fruit from the work performed is that which is conferred through the view of Christ's merits and promises; but the fruit from the performing work is that which is conferred through merit and the devotion of the celebrant. It is distinguished 2. according to the part of the thing, in merit, satisfaction, and petition, according to the aforementioned three points previously stated. It is distinguished 3. in general, specific, and most specific. The general fruit obtains for all living and dead faithful. Specialis (dicitur medius vel ministerialis ab aliis) obtingit tam eis pro quibus applicatur, quam assistentibus et concurrentibus ministrando paramenta, luminaria, hostias, etc.; specialissimus demum obtingit soli sacerdoti.

Here however a great difficulty arises among the DD. controversial, whether the Sacrifice of the Mass has an infinite value? There are two opinions present. The first opinion states that it has a value in act both intensely and extensively finite, so that when applied to many, it profits less each individually than if applied solely to one. Thus as Bus. above, hold Scotus S. Bonav. in 4th question, 45th article, third to last item Palud. Rich.

Major, et cetera 3 n. 38. The same is clearly taught by Scotus in Distinction 13, Article 2, where he says: "Intention (of the Priest) because it belongs to the essence of the Sacrifice, the aim responds with certainty ex opere operato, but taxed grace—Chapter III." Dub. I. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 155 parts of satisfaction, and thus when in many he shall distribute that, so much less does each one receive.

Now various authors employ different reasons for this opinion: Some say that since the value of the Mass is not taken from what is offered, but from the very offering itself, or from the action of the Priest who offers, which certainly cannot be of infinite value, they state that in the Sacrifice of the Mass Christ is not proximately offered, but only remotely, inasmuch as this was instituted to be offered by Priests. But this reason is commonly rejected, and justly so, both because a sacrifice offered by an evil priest does not become thereby as much defiled by his wickedness, as it teaches that he who offers it does not receive from him any limitation; and also because it is certain that in this Sacrifice Christ is at the same time Victim and principal Offerer, as is evident from the Council. Posterior. IV. Can. 3. where it was said: In the Church Christ Jesus is both Priest and Sacrifice.

And more clearly it is found where it has been said: For one and the same Victim there is now the offering of the Priesthood, who then offered himself on the cross out of a different motive of being offered. Others, however, employ this reasoning, because although the Mass itself suffices in its value as being infinite, yet its effect is limited by the will of Christ, who instituted this Sacrifice that it might produce a determined effect (independently of human disposition), whether it be a degree of satisfaction, which can increase according to greater devotion on the part of the offerer or for whom it is offered. And this opinion seems to be favored by D. 4 q. 3 ad. 2, where it is said: Although the virtue of Christ, which is contained in the Eucharistic Sacrament, is infinite, nevertheless a determined effect is ordained to which that Sacrament is ordered. Here the holy doctor speaks in article 4 question 2. But on the contrary, it is brought forward that the opinion which asserts that suffrages offered for one person do no more benefit him than they would other persons who are more deserving, seems less probable, saying thus: If therefore a suffrage offered for many were worth as much to each individual, and if a suffrage were offered only for one person, it seems that the Church should not have instituted that Mass or prayer be offered specially for any single individual, but rather that it should always be said for all faithful departed, which is manifestly false.

The reason for this opinion is confirmed by the prohibition of the Church, which forbids that the Mass be offered once to satisfy the needs of many who are petitioning. Hence the Priest who has received stipend from many, ought not to offer a single Mass for them; for he could certainly do so if the Mass were equally efficacious for all and one; but this was prohibited by the Council in its 10th proposition, which said: It is not against justice to receive stipend for many with one Sacrifice, and to offer one Sacrifice. The second opinion, however, commonly held today teaches

that the value of the Mass is infinitely intensive and extensive as regards sufficiency, on account of the infinite dignity of Christ, who is the Victim in this Sacrifice; and the principal Offerer is such. It is said to be intensively infinite, which can cause a greater or lesser fruit according to the measure of man's disposition. Autern extensivè, quatenus potest producere infinitos effectus et juvare ita uni soli ac infinitis hominibus. And the reason is because: as it teaches in Quod, with regard to the effect, this Sacrifice is said to be finite, not now from its institution, namely, as the first Sententia says, because Christ determined a certain definite degree of satisfaction in it, but from the finite capacity of those for whom it is offered, each of whom perceives a greater or lesser fruit according to his own and the offerer's disposition; similarly, although the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was of infinite value in kind as a satisfaction, yet does not actually produce an infinite effect in us, because it has the mode of a universal supernatural cause acting according to the subjects' dispositions: just as presumed Sacraments, though they have infinite virtue, act nevertheless limitedly.

According to this opinion, the Mass equally benefits many when applied, and even if it is applied to one individual. They hold thus, Gonet Man. to. 6 p. 336. Habert to. 5 p. 671. Juvenin. to. 7 p. 375 concl. 4. Petroc, to. 3 p. 512 q. 8.

Pignat. Chapter III. Dubium: I. On the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 157 in its Propitiatory 1. 4 q. 1.1. to. 8 p. 387, I say 2. and, of its: Contiu. to. 5 p. 743. . 2 p. 74. ex n. 320. Wigandt tract. 12 n. 78. 3.

Cross, lib. 6 p. 2 n. 42. eum. Et pro hac sententia clarè est praesumptum D. ubi sic ait: Quamvis... haec oblatio ex sui quantitate sufficiat ad satisfaciendum pro omni pena, tamen fit satisfactoria pro illis, pro quibus offertur, vel praesumptum afferentibus secundum quantitatem suae devotionis et non pro tota pena. Not against him can it be said. The Doctor in the places cited above; for where he says that the Mass has an effect, determined, certainly it should be understood as a determination not from the part of Christ, but subjected, joined, and measured by my disposition. Where, however, He says that the Mass applied to many is less beneficial for each individual, this is not speaking about the Mass as a sacrifice, but rather as a suffrage instituted by the Church, which certainly has a finite effect; and thus, the more it is so applied, the less it benefits each one, since it is certain that prayers of the Mass, instituted by the Church, are more beneficial to many individuals than if applied individually to each one, as is evident from the Council. Constantiensi, ubi damnatus fuit, hic articulus Constantiensi fuit; ubi damnatus fuit, hic articulus Wiclefi: Speciales orationes applicatae unipersonae per Prelatos vel Religiosos non

plus prosunt eidem quum generales ceteris partibus.

Neither does it hinder that prohibition of the Church against receiving multiple stipends for one Mass. For it is replied that the stipend is not given as a reward for the fruit of the Mass, but for the sustenance of the minister, as we said regarding simony 1. 3 n. 55. Wherefore, since he always has his own sustenance as minister, there is lacking a title by which to receive another stipend. It is replied 2ndly that, since the opposite opinion is not improbable, the Priest cannot apply the fruit of a Mass which he has begun for an uncertain stipend. Neither does it hinder that if this opinion were valid, the Church would multiply Masses in vain; for as we have said, the fruit of the Sacrifice is not received according to its own proper value, but according to the disposition mentioned above.

VI. Quod si haec sententia valeret, Ecclesiæ Missas frustra multiplicaret; nam respondetur (ut diximus), quod fructus Sacrificii non percipiatur juxta suum proprium valorem; sed juxta dispositionem Lib. Treatise. III. Of the position of the Eucharist, to which this designation is applied, and from this it happens that the sacrifices are repeated many times for one, so many times the fruits are shared. The second opinion, speaking speculatively, appears more probable; yet because the contrary is still probable, it is not permissible for the Priest, when receiving the stipend from one, to apply the Mass for that person in general with others; unless perhaps under the condition, namely, that he not be defrauded.

Notandum hic, quod Sacrificium Misse, in quantum pertinet ad fructum principalem, tam proposit est si offeratur a malo Sacerdote, quam a bono; cum valorem Missae sit ex opere operato pendens a meritis Christi: in quantum autem pertinet ad fructum precum, quae in Missa dicuntur, ipsae etiam valent factae a Sacerdote peccatore, quatenus hic orat nomine Ecclesiæ, quia Ecclesia semper est Deo grata; secundum quatenus orat nomine proprio. Tali dixit Alexander Papa (Can. 91 causa i qu. i.): Sacerdotes quantum digniores fuerunt, tantum facilius pro quibus clamant exaudiunter. He, however, considers in c. art. 7 ad 3 that if one celebrates Mass while excommunicated, because he is separated from the unity of the Church, his prayers do not have efficacy. And I think it more true to say this when speaking of an excommunicated person who is avoided: according to common opinion, and as stated by 3 R. 2. et contra and Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 49., following Soto and Avila, that the Church permits, because it allows faithful persons to request Masses from him, consequently also permits those very same persons to receive benefit entirely from such requests. See n. 30g. 33 « 1.

Priests gravely sin by ordinance, if they do not celebrate on solemn feast

days at least three or four times in a year, unless they be legitimately hindered. Ita Sylv. Reg. contra l. 1 espad. comm. c. 6 qui ex eunt Cap. III. Dub. I.

Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 15g of salt. 15g of salt. except for mortal sin, provided they communicate at Pasch, and there be no contempt or scandal. except for mortal sin, provided they communicate at Pasch, and there be no contempt or scandal: but where excuses are made, if the Bishops have given no commandment. » Here there is a doubt i. Whether priests are bound to incur grave guilt sometimes in celebrating? The more common first opinion holds as D. 10. 80 s. 1. 5 tr. 5 c. 3 n. 1. p. 12 n. 2 with Vasquez from that which the Apostle (To Hebrews 5) says: For every high priest taken from among men is constituted on behalf of men in things pertaining to God, so that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. Prob. 2 ex verbis.

Christi (Lucas 22); Hoc facite in meam commemorationem. The words declare 1 to contain a true precept, saying: 'Apostles and their successors in the priesthood, that they may offer, He has commanded by these words, "Do this." The ecclesiastical precept is confirmed 1. from the chapter of Dolentes concerning the celebration [of Mass], thus did he say: Dolentes refer us, that not only some lesser clerics, but also presumptuous certain prelates of the churches, spend nearly half the night in superfluous communions... There are others who scarcely celebrate the solemnities of Masses four times a year, and what is detestable they despise. And if ever they do celebrate them, they intend to interrupt externally with the colloquies of laics, etc. Therefore these things and similar ones must be entirely prohibited under the penalty of suspension, strictly commanding by virtue of obedience that both the nocturnal and diurnal Office should be diligently celebrated together devoutly. The reason for this judgment, which he presents, is: Because each one is bound to use grace given to himself, if it be opportune, according to that (2 Corinthians 6): We exhort you not to receive the grace of God in vain. The opportunity for offering the Sacrifice is not solely considered in comparison to the faithful of Christ, to whom it is necessary to minister the Sacraments; but principally in comparison to God, to whom this Sacrament is offered by consecration. Hence Thomas, the sentient one, refers to those priests who have never celebrated as not having gravely sinned according to the expunction from his Commentary ordered by St. Pius V; but the second opinion, which is held by S. 2 q. 1 and Cajet. 1 c., and also Alesis and Victoria in loco, says that a priest secluded from scandal should be precisely exempted from his ordination: not bound to celebrate; and this opinion Lugo adheres to very strongly in d. 20 n. 2, saying that the primary reasons for the first opinion do not sufficiently refute it.

The reason for this second opinion is that it does not pertain to a precept; not to a divine one, for that precept, thus do this etc., has not been given to individual priests, but to their community, namely so that they may take care that the offering of this Sacrifice be not lacking in the Church of God. In the text of the Apostle, "Omnis nòmque Pontifex," expresses merely the power which each individual priest has to offer sacrifice, not the obligation. To the precept supposed in c. Dolentes; Lugo responds that the penalty of suspension regards those who merely speak from the choir. That said penance does not induce a grave sin, of which there is no remission but by being endured. That the text there speaking about the celebration of Masses speaks only of Prelates of Churches.

But as for the reason, one could respond to D. Thomas that from there no precept is inferred, but merely advice, according to the word of the Apostle, we exhort you. And therefore, more than a few authors who subscribe to this opinion do not exempt the Priest from never celebrating Mass in a year, even if he privates himself and the Church for the sake of a venial fault; but they do exempt him from mortal sin. S. Pius autem dicitisse Cajetam expanxisse opinionem: non ut falsam, sed ut minus probabilem et contrariam sententiam D. Thomae. Chapter III. Bubble.

I. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. Nevertheless, these objections not withstanding, I subscribe to the first opinion, which is much more common and safer: all the more so because Lugo, n. 13, says that in this day it is not possible to excuse the celebration of the Mass by a negligent priest on account of a grave reason of scandal, because this would be a sign of a bad conscience. But he himself merits this opinion, that a presumptuous judgment is made concerning a priest who does not celebrate for an extended period of time, such as six or eight months, as stated in n. 44. Hinc ideo concluditur, sententiam contrariam, saltem propter scandalum, pauciorem esse probabilem. Doubt is cast.

How often in a year is each priest bound to celebrate under grave necessity? In this matter the doctors greatly disagree. D. 10 ita dicit: Unde sacerdoti, etiamsi non habeat curam animarum, non licet omnino cessare à celebratione; sed saltem videtur, quod celebrare teneatur in praecipuis festis, et maximè in his diebus, in quibus fideles communicare censuerunt. These principal Feasts, explains Soto according to Benedict: lib. 9, tract. 3, cap. 1, are understood as referring to the Nativity. Domini, Pascae, et Pentecostes, in quibus ait olim fideles consuvisse communicare: sed 378 his addit: Festa Ascensionis, Corporis Christi, Nativitatis B.

Of the Feast of the Virgin Mary, of the Annunciation, of the Purification, and of the Assumption: But Merbesius, in p. 3 q. 21, et Hab., in pag. 685 q. i, hold him bound to celebrate them on each Lord's day, and on feasts, and especially on the more solemn ones. And the same [person] says on page 1: "What the faithful are bound by law to interest themselves in the Sacrifice, the same priests are bound to offer." They gather this from chapter 14 of the twenty-third Decretal, where it is said: Let the Bishop see to it that at least on the Lord's days and solemn feasts the priests celebrate Masses... From this he says: It is a grave suspicion against so many priests who celebrate but once in a year. Finally, others, who hold the much more common opinion, think that priests are not bound to celebrate Masses, except three or four times in a year, on the most solemn feasts, as Busemb. says above, and c. 25 n. 82. Rich.

Palud. . §6 Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

Sylv. and Anacl. But Suer at the 80th question, first article. Later on, n. 13. And yet they do not consider it unworthy of probable opinion, Vasquez. G. In the month of November 1606, in the Council's decree (apud), where it was said: He who without just cause three or four times in a year fails to celebrate: sins mortally, and can be punished by the Bishop.

They nevertheless say: According to 6. cum.; Because all Religious Orders, whether Monastic or Mendicant, as is prescribed in Cælestinus 1. They do not hold that in the monastery, § sanely, according to the rule concerning the state of a monk (and the same is said about nuns in), each month they are bound to confess and on the first Sunday of the month to communicate, unless they abstain from communion according to the judgment of the prelate or confessor. But from this text I see induced an obligation merely to communicate once in a month, but not to celebrate otherwise. Moreover, it is not unteachable, 705. 2 v. I say that these Decrees do not clearly express a precept, but merely counsel; for there it is said only: Let them approach to Confession and communicate.

Wherefore c. where in the margin it is noted the aforementioned Clementine (thus it says): The bishops and other superiors of monasteries will diligently attend to this, so that in their constitutions they may be admonished (note) concerning the sanctimonial ones, that at least confession of sins be made by them once a month, and the most holy Eucharist be received. Wherefore Suárez concludes: Unless a special vow intervene, or unless it be constituted from the Institute of Religion, Constitutions oblige under mortal sin, no such obligation is rigorously binding. But as regards the parish, Haberl says in his first chapter: it ought not to be held that it should be celebrated there every day; but more

frequently than on Sundays and feast days. Chapter III. Dub.

I. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. But commonly and more truly they say that it should be celebrated only on feast days, in which the Parochians are bound to hear Mass; since these obligations are correlative, inasmuch as the people are required to hear Mass on those days, the Parish Priest is also required to celebrate it then. . 10 c. 24 q. 2 and 3. Barbosa in: 23 c. 14 cum Graff. Male. Molf. . 1. c. ubi dicitur: Si au-tém curam habuerint animarum, tam frequenter, ut suo muneri satisfaciant, Missas celebrant.

Therefore they sufficiently fulfill their duty if they offer sacrifices whenever the people are obliged to hear Mass. And this judgment is presumed by Benedict XIV 1: c. c. 3.: As for Bishops however, Habert says ibid., from the last chapter on privileges in 6, that it does not suit them to spend any day without celebrating Mass, except for a reasonable cause; But it should be noted that the text does not speak absolutely of celebration, but either of celebration or of the hearing of Mass. « 2. Even though in Cathedral Churches, collegiate, and conventual Churches (where there is a competent number of Priests), a Mass should at least be privately celebrated once daily, and another chanted, if the Rectors of such Churches sin mortally by omitting either one of them, it teaches that such Churches may omit one or even both of them on feast days falling on a weekday, for instance. Watch nights, of the Four Seasons, of Lent, or of Rogations. A solemn Mass on a feria following the Ninth Hour shall be omitted once, as stated in the same place from the Abbey.

» see sanctioned by our Father) » 3. Severe is the sin of him who is bound to offer Mass for another, yet applies the principal fruit thereof to others, because thereby he commits a grave fraud upon another. 4. Vide sancita à nostro P. Seriously sins I. Who is bound by 'Sacrum ex justitià 3:6, ought to delay that for a long time; because it privates another with great profit, Sylv.

Reg. 1. 23 n. 236. this case is bound to entail restitution of the reward. 3 c. 1 § 1. II. If anyone receives more stipends than he can adequately repay except after a long time. The reason is the same, Sylv. Reg.

III. He who with sacred mind was sent to be bound, and does not fulfill it. Bonac. d. ult. p. 8, even though it may be fallible, this is mortal, as it has . 1. 1 d. 5. See R. 9. Moreover, on page 4, topic 4, reason 196; and on page 6, topic 6, reason 6; and on page 5, topic 14, reason 81, where affirming that he who has promised to celebrate Mass for free in many instances can

suffice with one, yet others commonly deny this.

As regards the remuneration of Mass, this briefly notes certain prudently pre-arranged matters by our most erudite Pontiff Benedict. XIV. In their works concerning the Synod, the Mass, etc., formerly faithful priests offered bread and wine for the Sacrifices, in which whatever surplus remained was handed over to the use of those same priests and clerics. Then was it permitted to offer presumptuous oil, ears of corn, grapes, and similar things. Then was permitted to be offered money, which previously was not applied to the priests, but was sent to the chest for the distribution of the sustenance of ministers and poor; but with the lapse of time it has been entrusted to the priests themselves, that they may apply it in offering Masses. Which the Church otherwise approved with merit, against which the Church otherwise approved with merit, against the Wiclefites, who disapprove it; for as it teaches (2 q. 100 art. 2 ad 2), a priest does not receive money as a reward for the consecration of the Eucharist, for that would be simoniacal, but rather as a stipend for his own sustenance; and this is according to the Apostle's saying: "You do not know, because those who work in the sanctuary eat from what is in the sanctuary, and those who serve at the altar partake with the altar."

Sed quamvis res ita se habeat, hinc tamen erupit avaritia Sacerdotum, qui propter hoc lucrum pluries in die celebrabant; propterea id prohibuit Innoc. III. in o. Consultationes, de, Celebratio. Omission. But to this prohibition, Chapter III.

Doubt. I. In the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. Another sin succeeded lack of charity, for the priests in that same Mass consecrated many hosts, as many as there were almsgivers offering them. Others, however, would read the Mass three or four times a day up to the Offertory: then they would repeat all the Secret prayers as many times as they had recited them in prayer, and finally they would complete the Mass with one Canon, ending with as many Collects repeated at the end as they had recited at the beginning; thus they received their reward according to the number of repetitions. These Masses were called Bifocales and Trifocitas. But these have yet been eliminated.

Afterward others introduced several further errors into the midst, which had been proscribed in Propos. 8.9 and 10; these we refer to in n. 318 and 321. Seek. I. Whether rich priests can receive stipends for Masses? Cajetanus negat hoc, 2. 2 qu. 100 art. 2. 21 n. 5go, quia stipendium traditur ad sustentationem celebrantium; divites autem jam habent unde alantur.

But commonly and rightly they affirm. Section eighty-six, chapter three. Lugo d. 21 n. 18. et c. n. 5g2 cum ; et favet : Whether anyone ever fights for his own stipend? I to section 3, note 55. Qu. V.

Whether it is primarily simony to celebrate principally for the sake of remuneration? It is more probable that it is denied. See what was said there. What? Sixth.

Question. II. How does a priest sin by postponing the celebration of Masses with an accepted stipend? Indeed, he gravely sins if he delays long in celebrating Masses after accepting a stipend, as is stated in the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued on June 21, 1625, by the authority specially attributed to Urban VIII, and Father La Croix affirms all this in extenso in his book, volume 6, page 2, note 63. And n. 68 affirms the Decree, wherein it was thus decreed: Priests may receive alms and daily offerings, provided they have already satisfied the burdens previously imposed upon them, so that they may also bear new burdens; otherwise, they must altogether abstain.

But since the question had arisen whether those who have not satisfied the burdens undertaken may receive new burdens, the same Sacred Congregation, by the authority of Urban VIII mentioned above, thus decides: This doubt is raised as to the duration of time understood through that brief period of time. It is certain that a priest sins, if he celebrates the Mass sought for some urgent grace to be obtained, such as for a happy birth, avoiding danger, overcoming a lawsuit, he sends it forth outside of its proper time. Reason, because (as Lugo says well in d. 20 n. 45), the circumstance of time then pertains to the substance of the petition; hence, having passed that time, justly they add and at the end that the priest be bound to restore the stipendium, even if he should celebrate afterwards outside of the proper time. Nisi sufficiat restitutio stipendi, insuper monendum est eum qui stipendium dedisset, de tempore Missae apto omissis. It is certain that, if anyone gives alms to you, so that you may celebrate for him on this today's feast day, you would sin if later you perform the Sacrament; although Lugo d. n. 45 allows you to do that on tomorrow's day.

It is certain 3. that you do not sin by delaying, if having heard an impediment, you consent to a postponement, as explained by S.C. l.c. in the response to number fifteen. But having set aside these cases, Peyrrinus in Urban VIII spoke loosely, saying that a delay of three years, or six months, is moderate, as Arriaga judged. I likewise consider an excess a

delay of three months, whatever Pasqual may say, qu. 965. Renzi c. 4 q. 5o.-et . Cel. who wrongly cites for this opinion Lugo, d. 21, n. 34. cum. namely there, Lugo approves the doctrine of the aforementioned AA., saying that, a space of only two chapters, III.

Dub. I. From Eucharius, as it is a Sacrifice, they say that 167 months are but few; and thus Garzia considers it presumptuously, in chapter 5, note 57. They gather this from the chapter of the Presentiments. Caus. 7 qu. 1. ubi Pastor absens a sua Ecclesia per duos menses non dicitur defuisse eius Ecclesiae et ex 23 c. 1 de Refor ubi spatium duorum mensium reputatur modicum. These parities do not satisfy me: it seems to me altogether improbable what Lugo says in n. 45, that a member of the clergy would not sin by saying Mass promised within two months, and this opinion he approves presumptuously.

Where however he asserts to be common, saying thus: One can accept the stipend of the Mass for two months, just as we said about prayer on page 615. He considered. Whereby the reasonableness is thought by P. that a dilation of two months is not slight, according to the Declaration of the S. C. of the same Council published on July 17, 1655, which Bened refers to. XIV. (Nam et ubi dictum fuit, modicum tempus non reputandum spatium duorum vel trium mensium, sed intelligi infra mensem. They consider the delay of one month in Missae pro Defunctis meritoriously heavy, p. 13 n. 21.

Exco6. 1. 21 n. 161. et ab hac sententia non dissentiunt Sporer, c. dum dicunt, Missas pro Defunctis celebrandas eo temporis spatio, quo pro vivis. He, however, notes Tourn. I. c. quod, cum Missaes traduntur celebrandae aliciu communitati plurium Sacerdotum; tunc praesumatur qui dat eleemosynam pro multis Missis velle citius eas celebrari. This however is not to be understood; namely, that all the priests of that community should occupy themselves in satisfying such Masses, but rather that they should not delay for too long, as long as it was necessary, if those Masses were to be entrusted to one alone. Hence I say, then it is possible to distribute the whole number among the individuals of the community, or at least in its greater part if that be more numerous; and having made this distribution, the entire community will be able to satisfy itself within so much time as was conceded to each individual for satisfying his own rate.

Bene enim ait Holzrn. pag. 89 n. 185., quod has numerosas Missas committentes facile prævidere possint, quod communitas alias habeat obligationes. It is asked III. Si sacerdos omittere celebrare Missam peccet graviter, si stipendium pro illa acceptum non fuerit materia gravis? The first opinion denies it, and this is held by Sporer, tom. 3, pag. 142 n. 353. .

132 n. 217. Renzius l. i c. 4 qu. 40. et cum Henric.

Pell. Sanction, sed ex damno illato, quod in hoc casu per se non censetur grave, cum illud levi stipendio redimi possit; tum quia hujusmodi damnum spirituale non videtur grave in aestimatione hominum, cum ex omissione unius Sacri promissi non reputentur homines gravem injuriam pati. The second opinion, however, is more probable and is held by Holzrn. on page 83, note 366. Cross l. 6 part. 2 n. 154. with Aversa, 10 R. 1. with Passer et P. c. Ratio, because the gravity of the matter is more probingly to be measured not in relation to the stipendium, but to the fruit of the Mass, from which he who gives alms is deprived; and certainly a grave damage is thereby inflicted. As if, for instance, you were to lead a poor laborer by offering him a small stipend, so that he might open an access for rainwater to flow into your field, it would not be a light cause of damage to you if he neglects to put forth his effort.

It does not hinder to say that such damage can be compensated for by a small stipend; for it could indeed be compensated if another, who received the stipend, became aware of the omission of Mass; otherwise, if he remains unaware, certainly he will not be able to compensate for that damage. That such damage is regarded as light by men is not sufficiently proven; meanwhile it itself is weighty. Seek. IV. But one commits grave sin by omitting to say the Mass gratuitously beforehand?

They affirm, the Council on page 463, note 9. Navarr. 40 on the same ground, as above, because through such an omission great spiritual harm is incurred, Chapter III. Dub. I. Of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice, the 169th [promissory offering] is brought forth.

But probabilistically they deny it, Croix lib. 6 part. 2 n. 175. pag. 132 n. 218. Roncag. 1. c. . 1. 1 d. 6 n. 25. Diana part. 2 tract. 17. R. 9 recto. Hereupon presumed, n. 352 cum Portell. ac Pell.

The reason is either because a simple promise does not obligate under grave circumstances, as they say in note 3 on page 720 which Lugo holds in De Contractibus, d. 23 n. 39; at least, as Lugo says, unless the promisor expressly binds himself under grave circumstances. Or because, as Croix says, and . All agree that he sins gravely who omits the due Mass either from a vow or by command of the Prelate; for no one can doubt that this is matter for grave sin either through a vow or by command; see c. 5 n. 39. « 5. If any one gives a just stipend (it ought to be consuetudinary, or taxed by law, or if it is not, according to . Card. de Lugo d. 19 n. 259 secundùs si ambo dimidium tantùm justi darent; uti contrà Vasq.

If anyone gives a just wage (that is according to custom or law assessed as due, or if it is not, according to . . . Card. de Lugo, n. 259 secus, si ambo dimidium tantum justi darent; uti contrà Vasq. Conc.

Card. de Lugo loc. cit. quod tamen jam est probatum per Bullam Urbani VIII. V. Bonacina Diana treatise 14 resolution 7. "These two damned Propositions, however, above all, must be adverted to." The first number 8 stated: The duplicated stipend can lawfully be received by the Priest for the same Mass, applying to the petitioner a part of the presumed special fruit corresponding specifically to the celebrant, and this after the Decree of Urban VIII.

The reason for its condemnation is that the application of the special fruit is very uncertain; for although 151 and others (as Croix says in lib. 6 p. 2 n. 50 who thinks it probable with Aversa and Sporer on page 12 n. 255) allow it, VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist, they very probably state that a special fruit can be applied; however, they deny this. 2 n. 18.

Lugo, on the 21st day, note 33. Additionally, 68 other items and others say so. Second Proposition. condemned. no. 10 said: It is not contrary to justice to receive stipend for many sacrifices and to offer one sacrifice; nor is it presumptuous against faith, even if I promise, a presumptuously promised vow confirmed by an oath, giving stipend which I will not give for any other. Regarding the tax of just stipend commonly do the DDs say (v. sect. 2 art. ult. n. 2. Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 126. et ex Decreto S. C.) stipendium justum Missae non est quidem victus unius diei, ut dixerunt Sotus et Cajet. nam sacerdos praeter actionem sacrificandi potest in reliquo diei se occupare concionando, docendo, et similibus exercitiis licitis, ut lucretur integram sustentationem; sed est illud quod taxatum est a episcopo vel consuetudine vel saltem a viro prudenti, si deest taxa consuetudine vel a episcopo facta. Thus in the Concilium tomum octavum pag. 460 n. 2 l. 3 c. 1 §. 1 n. 2 et cum Coninch. Fill.

Regularly and commonly, according to the Declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council (as found in Bened.) XIV.) where it was said on the day 15 Novemb. 1698, according to the Declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council (as found in Benedict): Attention should be given to the consent of the place, or the Synodal Law, so that: if not otherwise, an alms suitable and competent to his discretion should be established by the Bishop. 320 Here there is doubt number one. Whether Regulars are bound to stand by the bishop's tax under grave obligation? Navarrus negat apertissime. Concerning page 461, note 3. Chapter number

5. With Vasquez.

Molina, and others commonly, from the Decree. The Sacred Congregation, in its decree on January 5, 1639, held thus concerning the alms for each Mass celebrated by Regulars in their churches: that it should be left to the discretion of the Ordinary to tax such alms according to the custom of the fourteenth place cited. Chapter III. Dub. I.

Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice: Doubt 2 arises, whether or not a Bishop can prohibit so that no more generous alms be given? It is certain that the law of the bishop, or the custom taxing stipendium, does not prohibit that faithful persons may give more, and priests receive less, if they wish, as is commonly taught etc. with five. It is certain that priests cannot exceed the stipulated amount in this way, because this would cause great scandal. Therefore it is commonly presumed . 86 sect. 2 et Bonac. I cite no. 9 with Corduba, Reg., and others.

The Bishop cannot prohibit this, if alms are spontaneously offered, as Lugo teaches in Responsum moraliter libri quinti distinctorii xviii capituli ii numeri xxxvii et cum Reg. C. Concilii die 16 Jan. 1649 (apud Bened. XIV. dict. Notif. 56. n. 11.) against the Bishop of Pistoria, who had promulgated this edict prohibiting it, but the Sacred Congregation responded: It cannot be prohibited; therefore, the Decree must be moderated. Doubt 3 arises: whether a bishop can prohibit that priests receive less just stipend? (Note what is mentioned below about the stipend in Italy being argentine or silver, or even lesser within our own Kingdom)? Soto denies this in Just. 1. 9 q. 6 art. 1 ad 2. 3 n. 1 0 6. D. Thom. 2: 2 qu. 102 art. 3.

But they more probably affirm. C. Q. I. R. 3. Bonaventura n. 9. cum Reg. Card. etc. ac Bened. XIV. dictNotif. 5 6 n. 1 1. ex Declaratione S. C. Conciliarium die 16 Julii 1689 ubi dictum fuit, bene posse episcopum prohibere et imponere poenam celebrantibus prominori quanta tetaxe.

Reason, because in some manner the Sacrifice of the Mass would be vile. Wherefore in such a case, if the Bishop prohibits this, it must necessarily be that all priests do not dare to obey: namely, as we have said (1. 1 n. 9 8), one ought to obey the opinion of a superior who has a probable reason for his command, being subject and willing to obey. What indubitably. Our opinion is not only probable, but also more probable by authority and reason. But what if, on account of a prohibition, the priest were grievously inconvenienced; see the aforementioned 1:4 n. 4 7.

Limitant.. Casu autem, quo Sacerdos jam acceptàrit exiguum stipendium

pro Missis celebrandis ab uno vel à pluribus (quidquid dicat in 6 p. 2 n. 64.) ubi confirmavit Decretum S. C. Coneilii editum jussu Urbani VIII quo sic fuerat statutum: Pro pluribus Missis...celebrandis stipendia quantumcumque...exigua, sive ab una, sive à pluribus personis collata fuerunt, aut conferen- tur in futurum Sacerdotibus..... S. C. sub obtestatione divini judicii mandat.....ut absolutè tot Missa cele- brentur, quot ad rationem attribute eleemosyne pre- cripte fuerint. This, however, is to be understood seriously, namely, when the priest knowingly accepted so many Masses for such a stipend; otherwise ignorantly, as rightly say Tournai 1. cit. v. Here, and. The priest, however, who promised the heir that he would celebrate Masses for the deceased testator at a certain time, with credit given for the stipend to be paid in the future, is bound to celebrate them before the payment of the stipend, in order to keep his faith, as well as Tap. . Dub. 4 rightly asks whether it is licit to agree on a stipend for Masses? He denies absolutely in P. Concina tom. 8 pag. 462 n. 6., that the Canons prohibit all agreements and conventions concerning the stipend of Masses, as is evident from cap. fin de Pactis, cap. Si nos de Simonia, etc. On the contrary, they commonly affirm in 2 cap. 35 n. 48. . Cons. lib. 2 cap. 3 d. 11. n. 8.

Roncaglia de 208. cum eod. tit. cap. 5 n. 1. cum Maldero, 3 n. 55. Reason, because although stipend is not given as a price for the Mass, nevertheless, when it is given out of justice for the sustenance of the Priest, as D teaches, nothing hinders Cap. III. Dub. I. Ratio, quia licet stipendium non detur ut pretium Missæ, tamen cum tribuatur ex justitia pro sustentatione Sacerdotis, ut docet D, nihil obstat Cap. III. Of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice, how it can be drawn into a covenant. 175

Neither do the cited canons stand in opposition, as they themselves have been abrogated by usage, according to Lessius, and concerning contracts, v. Cease, who says: In spiritual matters, every pact ought to cease from what is illicit. And it is solely these contracts concerning the celebration of Masses that are rejected by Cel. Miss. where holy things are concerned, what the bishops prohibit are importunate and unrestrained exactions of alms rather than requests... Therefore (as rightly says Lugo Resp. mor. lib. 5 d. 18 n. 7, speaking of this text of the Council), importunate and illiberal exactions are prohibited, not postulations justly, but which indeed they consider as avarice.

Moreover, in such matters, so far as it is possible, scandals should be avoided. Doubt is cast upon it. How is the remuneration for Masses to be assessed which the testator has left behind? If the testator did not assign a value, it should be assigned according to the valuation; but if he did assign a value, then correctly is the judgment made by the Council of 5., as stated

by Roncaglia: "the legacy is either abundant or scanty." «6. He who has received money from another, in order that for it a Mass may be said or that it be taken care of, speaking generally, can himself be called a priest performing a Mass for another good priest; less receiving than he has received.

"I have said this with reference to perjury; because Urbanus VIII prohibited that it be done on account of the semblance of an infamous Question None" "I have said." Good: because; if through evil it seeks to care, there is lost the fruit, which is from the work of the doer. See. In the Decree of the Sacred Council approved by Urban VIII and confirmed by Innocent.

XII. (Vide apud Croix n. 66.) sic sancitum fuit: Omne damnabile lucrum a Ecclesia removere solens, prohibet Sacerdoti qui Missam suscepit celebrandam cum certa eleemosyna ne eamdem Mis- sam alteri parte ejusdem eleemosyna sibi retendt celebrandam committat. After this Decree they contended that it was permissible to retain a part of the alms, which had been committed for the celebration of another Mass, asserting that this Decree had not been accepted. Therefore, the aforementioned prohibited in proposition 9, which stated: After the Decree of Urbanus, a priest to whom Masses for celebration are entrusted may satisfy another person, receiving from him a lesser stipend, and retaining part of the stipend for himself. Herefore our most holy father. P. Benedict.

XIV. In sua (ut melius poenam facilius ab hujusmodi turpi questu fideles amoveret), praecepit Ordinariis ut per edictum notum facerent quemcumque verba sunt Epistolae qui stipendia majoris pretii pro Missis celebrandis, quemadmodum locorum consuetudines vel Synodalia Statuta exigunt, colligens Missas retentas sibi parte eorumdem stipendiorum acceptorum, sive ibidem, sive alibi ubi pro Missis celebrandis minora stipendia tribuuntur, celebrari fecerit; laicum vero pro ter alias arbitrio vestro irrogandos poenas excommunicationis poenam, clericum vero seu quemcumque Sacerdotem poenam suspensionis ipsa facto incurrere et quibus nullus per alium quidem per nos ipsos seu Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem nisi in mortis articulo constitutus absolvi possit. Ab hac tamen prohibitione excipiunt I Roncaglia cap. 6 qu. 8 R. 2 v. Secondly, according to Passer. . Miss. lib. 3 c. 1 §. 5 n. 13, with Dicast. et Diana, and also Pasqual. ac Mendo apud Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 133 (and it is probable that this was condemned in note 8), the case where someone gives a greater stipend not so much out of regard for the Mass as from friendship, poverty, gratitude, proximity, etc., then the priest can retain the excess by committing another celebration of Mass: This, however, Croix I. c. cum Stephano does not admit unless he has expressed his special affection in words: But this limitation seems superfluous if it is morally

evident that almsgiving was given with regard to a person. Chapter III. Dub. I.

From the Immerse., as it is a Sacrifice. 175 Received II..5 page 190 question 7. Good. I. c. v. These, these, living lords and ladies chapter 7 and case, whereupon the Priest to whom the celebration is committed will freely and entirely at his own accord absolve you from that excess; then you lawfully may retain it; for he has the power to remit the whole, and thus also the part. But truly this must by no means be admitted, if you indicate a greater price received, and ask the Priest to remit it; or even inquire whether he consents that you retain part: for then you would not lawfully be able to retain it, even if he assented; for this is contained in the aforementioned Bull of Benedict.

XIV. tamquam execrabilis abusus vetitus est a pluribus Pontificibus, qui decreverunt (verba Bullæ) nimirum à quolibet Sacerdote, stipendio majoris pretii pro colebratione Missæ accepto, non posse alteri stipendium minoris pretii erogari, etsi eidem Sacerdoti celebranti et consentienti (nota), se majoris pretii eleemosynam accepisse indicisset. It is excluded III. Beneficiary who can properly commit another Priest to celebrate a Mass due to him for the Benefice, receives an appropriate stipend according to the custom of the place, without that which he delivers being called the entire net fruits corresponding to the celebration of that Mass. Thus, commonly Croix lib. 6 n. 13; . prop. 9 n. 9; Supra. d. 86 sect. 3; Pal, p, 14 n. 9. et Bon. et aliis. And it is evident from the Decree, approved by Ianus.

XII. In qua Bulla Nuper., ut diximus, n. 8, ubi dictum fuit, Decretum Urbani non habere locum, sed satis esse, ut Rector Beneficii qui potest missam per alium celebrare tribuat Sacerdoti celebranti eleemosynam congruam secundum morem Civitatis vel Provinciae nisi in fundamento Beneficii aliud cautum fuerit. See at Croix n. 96. The same is allowed to the capellanus amovibilis, as they say, n. 9. 21 n. 30. 83 n. 363: v. Distinguished from others here and there; and on March 15, 1745, it was confirmed by the Sacred Congregation Conalii through a Decree, which I myself observed when it was said, that this is permitted, provided for the Capella-176 Lib. VI.

Tract. III. On the Eucharist. By certain returns being annually constituted, and a perpetual chaplain assigned to such; similarly for the word, if such a chapel is provided for any Mass to be celebrated. Likewise to him who is entrusted with the celebration of perpetual Mass, as they say. 9. Cross n. 131. with Gob. and Pasqual.

And the same is said with Riccio, and 8 v. Thirdly, with S. and others, concerning the Priest to whom has been entrusted the celebration from a generous legacy, leaving life itself behind together with the burden of Masses. The reason for all this is because the Decretals prohibit retaining a portion of the stipend; they speak only of manual masses. These, however, rightly attend to Croix n. 132. Pasq. q: 976 et Conc. pag. 466 n. 15. quod si tradatur eleemosyna pinguior Sacerdoti singulari pietatis fama praedito, is nec praesumptum tradito eodem stipendio poterit alteri committere Missam nisi similis probitatis habeatur vel nisi aliqua causa excuset.

This however, says the Council, does not seem mortal, because a greater fervor of devotion for so great a thing is not commonly found as to induce grave culpability from the variation in celebration; rather better is it said by Croix, namely that this is not easily to be condemned as mortal, but sometimes can happen well, that someone may be grievously affected if the Mass is celebrated by another, and then it will be mortal. Doubt arises i., whether he who retains a part of the stipend, according to the condemned proposition above, does not only sin, but also fears presumption in regard to restitution. The first proposition denies this, and they hold it. 88 sect. 3. 4 q. ult. p. 8 n. 18. with S. Thomas, Possevius: Reason, because he who receives the stipend already acquires its dominion; although he acquire it with the burden of saying Mass, yet to this one it has been sufficiently satisfied by another: 14 res. 10. and Escobar lib. 22 n. 621: with Major, Aragon. Ledesma, etc., et post propositionem damnatam, recentiores communiter tenent, ut Vidal: in dict. prop. 9: n. 64: Croix lib. 6 p. 2... Cap. III. Dub. I.

Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 175 n. 135. Sporer page 146 note 369. Concerning. 8 p. 474 n. 16. Maz zotta tom. 2 pag. 429. he holds this to be at least more probable. c. against Bordon. The reason why 1 is derived from the very condemned proposition itself, since it was saying that a priest could be satisfied by another, retaining part of the stipend for himself, follows that the proposition is truly contradictory, namely that he cannot satisfy; but satisfaction regards not only the integrity of the act, but also presumed justice; therefore whoever does not satisfy the obligation of justice is bound to restitution.

Reason 2. Quod fortius urget est, quia, tamen si Sacerdos eleemosynam accipiens ejus dominium acquirat, illud tamen non aliter acquirit nisi juxta voluntatem dantis; voluntas autem dantis est, non solum ut Missa celebretur, sed ut celebretur tali stipendio; cum enim pignus tradens slipem dat intentione, ut uberiorem fructum ex Missa celebranda percipiat; ergo qui tradito minori stipendio per alium celebrari curat, peccat contra justitiam, non quia defraudat fructu Missae dantem eleemosynam, fructum

enim jam hic percipit ex sua ante habita pia dispositione, sed quia non exequitur dantis intentionem qua vult ut illa Missa, unde percipit fructum, tali stipendio celebretur; et quia hujusmodi intentio intrat in substantiam contractus, ideo si Sacerdos partem stipendii retinet injuste contra dantis voluntatem retinet. To whom therefore ought restitution to be made in such a case? Cross 1: cited with Pasch. saying that this can be done either for the alms given by the donor or for the priest celebrating; but more commonly and more reasonably do Tournely, Holzmann, and Spor consider that restitution should be made to the celebrant, because, having transferred the burden to him, a presumptuous right to the full stipend according to the will of the Lord is imparted. Dubitatur 2. Whether the Procurator or Executor of a testament, caring for the celebration of other Missas committed to him where there is less expense, may retain the excess for himself?

They affirm. Masses 1. 3 c. 1 § 5 n. 15. because that excess will be the fruit of his industry. But Merritto this is commonly rejected by Concina tom. 9 pag. 464 n. 12. . 9 damn. ab. n. 8, Renzi cap. 4 Question 45. Diana p. 10 tract. 16 R. 68 et Roncaglia cap. 6 qu. 8 R. 2. v. Never, with the sparrow.

Reason: firstly because such a procurator would make an infamous quest from alms; secondly because he has no title whereby to retain that profit for himself, since he never acquired dominion over those alms. It is doubted 3. Whether a Priest gathering alms for the celebration of Masses may retain something for his labor, if the Masses are not delivered to him so that he himself may celebrate them? They deny it, citing page 465, note 13. It is said that this was forbidden by the Bull of Benedict XIV, as stated in the aforementioned words, n. 3a1 v. In Decree.

Nevertheless, it affirms that such a priest should retain a moderate remuneration according to the reason of his labor. This does not seem improbable, if that priest is destined for such a task, and his labor truly deserves remuneration; for then such remuneration is owed to him by natural equity, and by the will of those who offer alms. The pontiff is reckoned to condemn only those who have gathered alms through industry and have wished to make a profit from them, namely by collecting stipends in one place and arranging for masses to be celebrated elsewhere where almsgiving is of less value than where it is received. Doubt is cast. 4. Whether a priest, to whom three oblations of julii are offered today, may celebrate himself, or whether he can provide that another celebrate for him in his place, promising to celebrate one julium for him tomorrow on account of the Missa which he has received tomorrow?

Croix affirms in his 1.6 p. 2 n. 134, and Mazzoto in his 1.2 p. 430, that this

would not be retaining a part of the price, which the Pontifical condemned, but merely exchanging Masses and days. However, correctly it is denied by the Council on page 466 note 16, because this could not be excused on account of the species of turpitudo mercimonii; yet, nevertheless, they dare not condemn it as a grave sin: and whether poverty can excuse one from all guilt, it refers to the prudent judgment. Doubt is cast. Whether administrators of churches are from Cap. III. Dub.

I. Regarding the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, it is stated that 179 alms given for Masses may retain something back for the expenses of the altar, servers, candles, etc., as confirmed by the Decree of the Council of S. C. Innoc. XII. ad n. 7. see ap. Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 95.) thus responded: It must not be permitted that... places or their administrators retain any minimal portion from eleemosynary offerings for celebrating Masses, on account of expenses incurred in the celebration of Masses, unless... they have no other income: and then... I should exceed the value expended, which are necessary to be offered only as part of the Sacrifice of the Mass itself for the altar, servers, lights, etc. And this is to be noted from another Decree of the same Sacred Congregation published on July 6, 1726, (as it is found among the Bened.

XIV.) ubi statutum fuit: Archipresbyteros non tenere ad ministranda utensilia iis, qui celebrant in sua Ecclesia ex obligatione Beneficii, sive Capellania. As regards Masses, however, they are to be held responsible for said subministration insofar as it permits them to be celebrated in their Church; nor are they to be held responsible for such Masses ad ventitias ad mitandas, unless the utensils have been set free by the celebrants. « 7. Beneficiati, praesumptum Curati, ad Missas obligati possunt pro iis accipere stipendium et applicare cui volunt: quia non semper habent obligationem applicandi ad certam intentionem; nisi tamen constet contrarium, ut de Missa Conventuali docet Bon. Ita C. de Lugo d. 81 s. 1 n. 21 et qui negant de Parochio: refertque determinasse Congregationem Card.: quod ei non liceat pro Missa accipere eleemosynam manualem, quando tenetur celebrare; de Missa tamen Conventuali, contra Quæritur I. An qui alicubi tenetur celebrare sine expressa obligatione applicandi Missas, possit alium stipendium recipere?

Response is given: Si in foundatione Beneficii vel Capellania expressum sit non esse obligationem applicandi pro fundatore, certe poterit aliud stipendium accipere, prout habetur ex Decreto S. C. Concilii edito die 13 julii 1630. (apud Bened. XIV. 180 De Eucharistia.] In quo dictum est: Si in foundatione Beneficii seu Capellania expressè constitutum sit non tenere celebratorem ad applicationem Sacrificii; tunc celebrans poterit accipere novum stipendium, et una Missa satisfacere obligationi Beneficii seu

Capellania, et item danti novum stipendium. And a similar Decree affirms Merati p. 3 tit. 12 n. 4, edited on February 13, 1630. On the contrary, however, it must be said, as was mentioned above against Busemb. and others, if in the foundation nothing has been expressed as is found in the Decree of the same S. C. approved by Innocent. XII. (apud Croix n. 92 ad 4.) ubi dicitur: Sacerdotes; quibus diebus tenentur Missas celebrare ratione Beneficii, seu Capella, legati, aut salarii, si eleemosynas pro aliis praesumpto Missis celebrandis susceperint; non posse eadem missa utrique obligationi satisfacere.

And (whatever corresponds to Lugo d. 21 n. 12.) this Decretum was clarified and more explicitly explained in another Decree of the same S. C. on August 18. March in the year 1686. (apud Benedict. XIV. 1. c. n. 9.) where it was decided that the celebrant should be held to be applied for on behalf of the soul of the testator; nevertheless, there should always and in the foundation itself never be any addition made, by whose suffrage the Sacrifice is to be applied. And the same was declared by the same S. C. on February 6, 1627 (see ibid.) concerning chaplains of Confraternities and Monasteries, who celebrate Mass in order that, as Confratres or Moniales, they may satisfy the precept of hearing Mass. Here however another Decree of the same Sacred Congregation issued on July 7, 1686 (see in Pittoni under Constitutions pro) where it was stated that chaplains and beneficed priests celebrating for the founder of the chapel or benefice should not be required to celebrate Masses during the time when the assigned capital dote is idle and unproductive, without their fault.

And lastly, this was confirmed likewise on August 8, 1705, in the same Pitton. 325 Doubt arises whether a prescription can be given regarding the burdens of Masses and the conditions appended to the foundation. They affirm. 3 tr. 1 c. 8 n. 13. cum. Meth. Miss. Linea tertia caput septimum sectionis una notatio prima numero uno, et apud Crux librum. Chapter II.

Bubble. I. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 18; 4 n. 852. and Gob. with the Roman Rota, as Tuschus testifies in ibid. Reason why a legitimate prescription holds against any right; and no exception is found in law regarding the burdens of Masses, whereby no prescription is granted concerning such burdens. From these authors, however, others require, for prescribing the aforementioned burdens, a space of twenty years with a title; and thirty without a title.

Others indeed according to 510. Sed quidquid sit de hoc; verius videntur nullo modo posse praescribi onera Missarum et conditiones a fundatoribus requisitae; tum quia (ut ait Conradus cap. 2 k. 10 num. 30) prima fundatio majorem habet vim, cum consuetudo datur; tum quia in Beneficiariis

difficulter praesumitur bona fides, cum ipsi facile praesumantur ex fundatione cognovisse leges Beneficii; tum denique (et haec ratio est potior), quia in eadem 5 sic sancitum fuit: Quandò igitur ex Beneficiorum quorumcumque erectione seu fundamento aut aliis constitutionibus qualitates aliquae requiruntur, seu certa illis onera sunt injuncta in beneficiorum collatione seu in quacumque alia dispositione; eis non derogatur. Therefore the Council has established that qualities requisited from the foundation, and burdens imposed, whether in the collation; or in any other pious disposition, can never be derogated from. Accedit Bulla Pii IV., quam confirmans irritat quidquid contra illud factum fieri; clausula autem Decreti irritantis ligat praesumptos ignorantias; et in causis beneficiatibus inficit titulum et possessionem, ut dicit Croix 1. 4. n. 657. cum Garic. Nicolas and others like him.

Accedit Bulla Innoc. XII. Apostolic. Ministeri (ampliata a Bened. XIII. Throughout the entire world, another Bull, In Supremo), where n. 27 states that any prescription granting a centenarian and immemorial exemption shall not be given against those matters in Quærit.

II. On what days shall the Parish Priest be required to apply? Mass for the people? Before the Section SS: N! PP, Bened. XIV. De qua mox infra dixerimus n. 325; olim plures fuerunt sententiae: prima sententia dixit eum teneri quotidianè si reditus sint pingues; si vero tenues, teneri tantum diebus festis.

Thus, those who decide this; and this, even if the Parochus does not have a suitable sustenance; nor is it satisfied, says Pignatell. But the Second Sententia said that there is no doubt that the Parochus should be held to celebrate divine services for the people according to divine law at some time in the year. As it is written: When the divine precept commands all those to whom the care of souls has been committed, to know their own flocks and to offer sacrifice for them, etc. The converse says that the Parochus should not be held responsible on his own: to apply daily the Mass for the people; for he would be required to celebrate every day, which is nowhere a precept. Thus . n. 50. with Suar Vasq. and others n. 52; either on the principal feasts of the Lord, and days of the Lord, or at least once in the week, as Bonac. The third opinion stated that from the power of the parishioner, the parish priest is not bound to apply the fruit of the Mass specially for the sheep. Ita. 22 disp. unic. part. 13 n. 7 cum . Steph. et Gob. apud Croix, qui probabilem putat L. 3 part. 5 n. 762.

The reason for these matters is that the office of Curates is to feed the sheep with the word; by example, in the administration of Sacraments and the dispensation of sacrifices; they said this would happen if such a

general application were made for all the faithful, and especially those who are particularly interested, and thus. They have understood it to be Trentine. Here they have complained, concerning all those Missae, Caput III. Dub. I. Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, it is possible for the parish priest to receive daily stipend; unless, however, he be bound by foundation, custom, or precept from the Prelate otherwise to offer for the people.

But today from the Encyclical Letter of our Sovereign Pontiff Benedict. XIV, edited on the 19th day. August 1754, which begins: When always (see at the end of this book, note 6), we have held that all parish priests are to be bound to celebrate Mass for the people at least on feast days, even if they do not have congruent sustenance, with these words: "This our mind; and the sentence is, that it has been judged and defined many times by praised Congregations as fitting, that all, and each one who exercises the salvation of souls in act, whether parish priests or secular vicars alone, but also presumed regulars are equally bound to apply the parochial Mass (on all feast days) for the care committed to them over their people." And quia alii ailegabant se non hapere congruos reditus, alii dicebant contrariam alicubi esse consuetudinem: Nos autem (sic praescribit et loquitur Pontifex) ad praecedentes praedictae Congregationis Concilii resolutiones nostram approbationem et confirmationem extendimus, et quatenus opus sit auctoritate Apostolica iterum tenore praesentium decernimus et declaramus, quod licet Parochi et alii ut supra congruit reditibus destituantur quidem immemorabili consuetudine in eorum Parochiis obtinuerit ut Missa pro populo non applicetur eadem nihilominus omnino in posterum ab ipsis debeat applicari. And although (additionally) a response from the Council Congregation has been given that the parish priest should daily apply the Mass for the people with abundant revenues, nevertheless because controversies have been perceived to arise over this very matter; for this reason we deem it opportune to declare that it is abundantly sufficient for us that those who exercise the care of souls celebrate the sacrifice of the Mass for the people and apply it on Sundays and other feast days throughout the year according to the precept.

Item declarat ibi Pontifex, hoc valere praesumptum pro iis locis et diebus in quibus populus Missae interesse debet, at aliunde servilibus operibus vaticare potest, 184 Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eudist.

Therefore, in the case where a Parish Priest is so poor that he is compelled to live on alms: the Bishop is granted the faculty to dispense with this requirement, so that he himself may apply the Masses on presumed feast days for those offering alms, provided that within the same week he applies the omitted Masses for the people. And what concerns those who

are deputed to the care of souls, when the Parish Church is vacant, it grants to Bishops the faculty of assigning them a suitable portion from the fruits of the Parish for the burden of celebrating on feast days for the people, although the fruits themselves pertain to the Apostolic Camera; and even though a portion has already been assigned to them according to the Constitution. S. Pii V. sed non ait sufficiens. 36 Deinde decrevit Pontifex sua Apostolica auctoritate, ut Missa conventualis, quae singulis diebus canitur a Clero praedictarum Ecclesiarum, pro earumdem benefactores quotidie applicetur, respiciendo benefactores in genere cujuslibet Ecclesiae. And this, notwithstanding any custom to the contrary. Unless, however, there be some place where it is customary to apply both the first and the presumed second conventual Mass for the benefactors of the Church, he declares that it is not an obligation to apply the second Mass in the Memento of the second Mass for the dead; rather, let the commemoration of those very dead be made in the Memento of the second Mass.

Atque ita haec Bulle loquitur Pontifex de obligatione Canonorum canendi aut psallendi in Choro, alias restituendi fructus Praebendarum et distributionum, si tantum assistunt et non psallant aut canant; quo improbabiles reddidit opiniones oppositas. See regarding this, the aforementioned lawbook, volume 3, note 675. dubium 3. Afterward, however, having noted these things, another question arose which has not yet been discussed among any Fathers, nor have I found it indicted, namely: whether a parochial priest (or bishop, for what is said about the parish priest should be more strongly applied to the bishop), if he cannot celebrate for the people through surplice, is bound to celebrate through another? Many learned men consulted on this doubt; some denied it, saying that this obligation of celebrating for the people includes not the obligation of praying for the people. Cap. III. Question. I. Post quasdam haec notatas aliam insurrexit quaestio quam apud nullum Ante- cipatorem usque hodie discutiatam non inveneri scilicet an Parochus infirmus (sive Episcopus nam quod dicitur de Parochio fortius dicendum est de Episcopo) si non possit celebrare pro populo per seriptum tenentur celebrare per alium plures Doctos super hoc dubium consului alii negarunt dicens hanc obligationem celebrandi pro Populo includi obligationi orandi pro Populum cap. III. Dub.

Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 185 Lo, what the Parochus possesses; but since this obligation to pray personally is hindered, the Parochus who is prevented from praying for the People is not bound to have another pray instead, just as he who is prevented from celebrating Mass is not bound to have it celebrated by another. But I, considering the opposite, hold it entirely to be held. Reason, because the parish priest is not only bound to

celebrate Mass for the people, but also to apply a presumed Mass to the people, as that same Pope Benedict declared in 1744 in the aforementioned Bull, Cum semper (Vide to. 4 ejus Bullarii). And this proceeds according to the words of St. Paul (Heb. 5:1): For every high priest taken from among men is constituted on behalf of men in things pertaining to God; that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. And moreover he confirms the same in verse 3, saying: And therefore he ought to offer, as for the people, also presumptuously and for himself, for the sake of sins. The obligation however of the Pastor to pray for the People is indeed personal; but the obligation to apply the fruit of the Mass to the People is also personal (for if he can celebrate by himself, he cannot celebrate through another), and it is a real presumption, since it is one of the obligations annexed to the munus of the Pastor, as was said in the Council of Trent, session 23, chapter 23, where it is stated: Since the Divine precept commands all to whom the care of souls has been entrusted to know their sheep and to offer sacrifice for them, and to proclaim the words of Divine doctrine, etc. This other Divine precept is found in John (21:17): Feed my sheep.

Therefore, congruent est tenendum Pastor suas oves pascere prædicatione, Sacramentorum administratione, correptione etc.; sic praesumptum teneatur pascere applicando eis fructum Sacrificii; quapropter, congruent Pastor impeditus, quominus prædicet vel Sacramenta administret, tenetur prædicare et administrare Sacramenta per alium; ita impeditus, quominus applicet per seipsum Populo Missam, tenetur per alium ap 186 Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist: to allow the fruit of the Sacrifice, which is pasture more useful, by which the People can be nourished.

If however Parishes and all those to whom the care of Souls is committed are bound by precept to celebrate Mass on Sundays and Feasts and apply it to the People; much more are Bishops bound thereto as principal ministers of Souls, for the same chapter says that the celebration of Divine Mass or its hearing (so far as regards Bishops) is only a matter of decorum, not however of obligation. Because, according to the text, bishops and their superiors are situated for different reasons apart from their churches and deacons frequently absent themselves, nor can they always conveniently approach the churches for celebrating or hearing Mass; without which it is not fitting (note: not fitting) for them to pass any day without a reasonable cause: we grant by the present Constitution indulgence to them that they may have a vicar at the altar and celebrate or have celebrated there divine worship wherever it is permitted to celebrate or hear divine worship without transgression of interdict. 38 8. He who has received stipend for the Sacred, is bound to say Mass for the dead, or he who has received stipend for the Sacred, is bound to say Mass votively, or in this altar, or

that altar, as offering money petitions (provided always that the rubrics permit what is neglected, by which neglects the order of the Church would be inverted, it does not suit out of devotion to another). Si tamen aliter faciat, non erit grave; imo nullum, si fiat justa de causa. V. . Cardinalis de Lugo 1. c. n. 35. 32g 9.

Whoever, intending to fulfill what regards place, time, intention, or quality of Mass, without just cause leaves undone something necessary, sins against the will of the founder; and indeed gravely, if he often does so, let his heirs consent: for they cannot derogate from this will of the testator, as teach Sylve. . and Tann. If however someone impedes what place, Chapter III. Doubt. I. [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions]

[TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] For if he had not had any special purpose, or if the cause has ceased, namely, if the family is extinct or dwells elsewhere, then the Priest will sin only venially by changing the altar; and not even venially, if he celebrates in a privileged altar, because there he better consults the founder; thus Lugo n. 36 and 37, and Tourn. 1. c. Caeterum advertendum, apud P. Ferraris verb. Capellania, n. 14., referri plura Decreta S. C. Concilii, quibus dicitur pro hujusmodi dispensatione semper adeundam esse Sedem Apostolicam. Note II. Quod si quis stipendio accepto deberet Missam celebrare in altari privilegiato et in alio celebraret non jam teneretur ad restitutionem stipendi sui sed tantùm ad lucrandas Indulgentias applicabiles pro defunctis; ità 210 cum ac qui addit non esse quidem obligationem restituendi si eleemosyna data sit ordinaria secùs vero si pinguis.

Non autem satisfacit, qui celebrat in alio altari non privilegiato, applicando Indulgentias Calculi benedicti, Imaginis etc., quia ha Indulgentiae non sunt tam certae quàm Indulgentiae altaris privilegiati. Dub. I. Non autem satisfacit qui celebrat in alio altari non privilegiato, applicando indulgentias calculi benedicti, imaginis etc., quia haec indulgentiae non sunt tam certae quàm indulgentiae altaris privilegiati. Of the Immergence, as it is a Sacrifice. 189 gati; as they say with . and with others commonly (contra etc.) in the Calculation blessed with Indulgence for the liberation of an soul from Purgatory in the celebration of Mass. « 10. Beneficiated from justice is obligated under mortal penalty, and the punishment of compensation, to that number of Masses, either by themselves, or (by the words collected concerning the founder), at least through another.

"(Unless it is primed in the institution of Capellania, which allows that the Capellanus, if he does not celebrate by stipend, can always celebrate through another." Thus rightly teaching with 4 R. 87. Whoever is assigned to the Campanile is thus declared by the Sacred Congregation; and similarly it was decided by the Sacred Roman Rota, no. 1171, who affirms another declaration. The Holy See edited on 17 September. » 1683., quem numerum litterae fundationis requirant; eum vero numerum ex justa causa, v.g., si reditus jam non sufficienter respondeant, possit minuere Episcopus in Synodo: quam polestatem Bon. restringit ad Missas defunctorum, et quidem post Trident impositas.

See Bonac. d. 4 q. ult. page 8. The reduction of Masses today can only be carried out by the Apostolic See, and not by bishops, as is evident from the decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Council at the command of Urban VIII and confirmed by Innocent. XII. (see at Croix 1. 6 part. 2 n. 63. v. And precept where it is thus said: District prohibits... lest.

Bishops in Diocesan Synod, or Generals in General Councils, or by any other means reduce the burdens of celebrating Masses either imposed after that same Council, or at the threshold of foundation, but for all these matters, recourse should be had to the Apostolic See. Otherwise, if such reductions, moderations, and commutations are found to have been made contrary to this prohibition, they must absolutely be deemed null and void. The faculty, however, as clearly explains the same Decree (whatever they may say concerning the State of Religio [Statu Rel.], c. 7, Lib. 190). VI. Treatise. III.

On the Eucharist. no. 148. granted by the session twenty-five of Trent, chapter four. To bishops and others, it was given only for reducing those Missae which had been left antecedently to the Council, and not imposed at the threshold of foundation. On the contrary, in the same Decree of Urban (apud Croix n. 89) it was declared that bishops could lawfully reduce masses, if the testator had expressly granted this power to them. The reasons, on account of which the Apostolic See is accustomed to reduce Missas, are the scarcity of priests, meagreness of stipends, or augmentation of current stipends, diminution of the monastery's revenues, or greater necessary expenses for sustenance, etc., finally if there be pressing necessity for the brothers, or for the church's or monastery's fabric; as Wigandt translated 12 n. 80. et c. n. 144. thus. Barbosa, Lez. et aliis.

Dubitatur i. Whether a bishop can diminish masses whose burden is not he

who receives them out of alms' meagreness? Croix affirms n. 119 with Pasq., and Sed negandum is to be denied according to P. Gonc. from the Decree of S. C. mentioned above, where it is declared that in no way can Bishops reduce or moderate the burdens of Masses; this was expressly declared by the same S. C. in another Decree, which the aforementioned Council again confirmed through another Decree: issued on July 20, 1682. But this is to be understood as proceeding by way of exception, says Fagnanus in c. Ex parte de cum Felino, when previously such burdens of Masses could be fulfilled either according to law or fact, but in a case where at first the revenues were sufficient, and subsequently diminished so much that they no longer suffice for bearing the burden, then Fagnanus says that it does not appear that the faculty of bishops, which they have by common law to moderate or commutate Masses, is taken away from them, according to c. Nos quidem de Testam., et 8 where it is conceded to bishops that they may together with an heir or executor change the last will for a pious use. Doubt is cast upon it.

Whether a chaplain may of himself diminish the number of masses, if the revenues should fall short? If they should totally fall short without any fault of their own, it is certain that they are not bound by Canon III. Dub. I. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. To celebrate nineteen masses, as they commonly say Croix in book 4, note 855. In the Missal, book 3, chapter 1, section 2, note 2 and section 3, note 89. With Pasquali and Passeri and Escobar, in book 21, note 637. With Bordon and Aversa.

That was declared by the Sacred Congregation as we said in note 324 at the end. Si vero reditus deficiant in parte, etiam videtur certum cum Escob, n. 638, posse Capellanum minuere Missas, casu quo testator congruam eleemosynam designaverit, v.g. tarenum pro qualibet Missa; quia tunc congruent augendus esset numerus. If the revenues of the masses were increased, then they should be diminished accordingly if the revenues decrease. The greater difficulty is whether the Capellanus can diminish the number of Masses, if the testator has designated a certain number of Masses and the stipend for the ordinary falls short? They deny Diana, tractatus 10, rubricae 65, distinguitio 1, pagina 6, numerus 23. et cum.

Philip. Pellet. et Lezana. They say that for this moderation it is altogether to be referred to the Apostolic See; both from the Deoreto mentioned above, where it was said: For reducing these matters or moderating them, refer to the Apostolic See; and also from another Decretal (see ap.). Croix n. 89.) whereupon they inquire: What if the burden imposed upon him be so slight that he cannot bear it; and if recourse must be had to the Apostolic See for moderation of the burden, will all or nearly all of this

have to be borne in expenses necessary thereto? Thus it was declared: Although a burden may be so slight that it does not merit bearing the aforementioned imposition, nevertheless, if it is necessary to recur to the Apostolic See for the reduction of such a burden, those to whom it pertains must go to the Apostolic See, which will decree this without any expense. However, this does not prevent them from affirming in Decretum 5 de Escob. lib. i cap. iii in praxi that they consider it probable.

The reason for this is because it is considered in accordance with the mind of the testator, who is not presumed to have wished to compel Capellanus gratuitously or by a smaller just stipend to celebrate [the obligation] or to supplement the salary from his own goods if he wished to have someone else perform it; otherwise, the will of the testator would be unjust, which ought not to be observed. Because in this there might easily arise a risk of hallucination, he [i.e., the author or legislator] adverted to it in n. 855 and 13), or at least wise and pious men, who do not regulate the numbers of Masses as an authoritative judge, but rather as a just arbiter, will moderate them. The Apostolic See reserves for itself the response to the aforementioned Decretals, but it is a cessation from an obligation pro rata according to the deficit in revenues; for the Decretals speak according to the intention where the discourse is not yet about diminished revenues, but about a small alms initially designated for Masses, which are not easily found by those who wish to celebrate them, and concerning those [Masses], he sought either an increase in stipends or a reduction in the number of priests. And if this opinion be probable, I refer judgment thereof to the wisdom of the prudent. Certaine, si staret haec sententia, omnino servandum esset id, quod advertit § 3 num. 96., nempe, quod si Capellanus per annos praeteritos acceperit stipendium majus solito, teneatur compensare eumdem numerum Missarum celebrando; qui enim antea habuit commodum, deinde pati debet incommodum.

Doubt is cast upon it. Whether a Bishop can moderate Offices; prayers, and almsgivings annexed to Anniversaries? Sed Pasqual negat hoc; affirmat autem quia prohibitio non loquitur de his, sed tantum de reductione Missarum; uti praesumptive nec de illis Missis, ad quas aliquis Sacerdos se obligasset sine congruo stipendio; id enim esset in praejudicium Ecclesiae et successorum. But this last must be admitted in many ways, because it would be contrary to the Decrees referred above dub. i. 32 » 11. He who is bound by reason of Benefice to celebrate daily is bound presumptuously to apply the Mass for the founder (unless contrary intention be evident).

Bon, and others who nevertheless concede it, Chapter III. Dub. I. On the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 195 to be able to offer Him four or six times in a year (Or for one who is very closely connected to him, while being a

dear friend or benefactor; thus the founder is presumed to have consented, as stated in no. 36 with Homob. Nald.

Only let not the stipend be received, as rightly they advert, and with Pasq. and Gob., and because this would be against the mind of the founder); and on the day of commemoration of all the dead to celebrate Mass for a particular deceased (See below n. 338). Also omitting one Mass in any week for devotion and reverence's sake, which is done from the presumed intention of the founder: that it not be held as certain, except by limitation contrary to the will of the founder, or become a burden upon the Church or Monastery to care for daily Mass. V. . c. R: 23 et t. 13 R 51. That very limitation is found in lib. 5, d. 9: if the obligation is directed toward that same Priest, for example, if it is said (he who ought to celebrate daily), then in that case it grants permission (Thus commonly presumed with Leand., where it is stated that the Capellanum should be held to celebrate daily, provided there is honor and due devotion). However, it is noted that on no day will the Cappellanus be able to vacate if in the foundry expressed caution has been taken, so that Mass is celebrated either by itself or through another, according to the Declaration. S. C. die 30 maji 1699) Si vero dirigatur ad celebrationem in tali loco, v. gr., ut quotidie celebratur Missa in talis Ecclesia, teneri eum pro se alium substituere eo die, quo ipse non celebrat. (Ita) Qui non potest fundationi satisfacere propter 33 morbum, non tenetur, si brevis sit v. gr., 15 dierum, ut docet Bonac. aut praesumptum unius, alteriusve mensis, ut probabiliter docet, substituere alium, aut compensare, cum tam stricte nec Tom, V. 13 Lib.

VI. Tract. III, On the Eucharist. "Indeed, with regard to the dominion they exercise over their servants; yet otherwise, if it be a protracted illness; unless the returns are excessively meager, or are absorbed in the illness itself, so that contrariwise." Sylv. et Impeditus vero aliis negotiis, licet justis (cum haec non debuerant obesse fundatori), debet satisfacere per alium, vel compensare: postea praesertim si fiat saepius.

Ita Bon. d. 4 q. ult. p. 7: Quæretur, an capellanus ægrotans tenetur interim alio dare stipendium ut missascelebret? Common is (contrary to Henryq.) not to be held bound by him if the illness is brief, just as Bus. holds Lugo d. 21 n. 48 etc., unless the founder wished not to fail in celebrating Mass at such a place etc. But what constitutes a brief illness? Others say, if it lasts for ten days, as Barbos states. Molfes. And concerning this, there is a Declaration of the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued on the 17th day, number 1595, in which it was stated, that the chaplain not be considered suppliable by another during a time of infirmity not exceeding fifteen days.

Others to the month, as stated in n. 35 with Hurtado and the Council. Mediol, 7 tit. de Missis, ubi: Si Cappellanus saltem per annum celebravit in alio loco, si praesumptum per mensem ægrotet, adhuc integram eleemosynam judico Episcopi accipere potest. Others extend it to two months, as Lugo n. 49 with ... c. and adheres and adheres as aforementioned, and Dicast., and Dicast. All these opinions, however, seem to be probable. Note casually this, which Benedict observes. XIV. concerning the Sacrifice.

Miss. 1. 3 c. 23 n. 2, prohibited the Sacred Congregation thirty Gregorian Masses, that is, where circumstances do not permit, to be referred. Whether, however, it is permissible to receive a stipend for the first Mass which a neo-presbyter celebrates with the Bishop? See what is said in no. 829, verse v., concerning whether or not. DOUBT II. Whose is it to apply the fruit of the sacrifice? From whom is it fitting that the fruit of the Mass be applied?

Whether a Religious may validly apply the fruit of a Mass against the will of the Prelate? P 335 The application should be made before the celebration. Qu. I. An Religiosus valide Missam applicet contra voluntatem Prælati P 335 Applicatio debet fieri ante celebrationem. Is the application of the habitual grace sufficient? What?

II. If someone has received stipends from various sources, is it sufficient to apply Masses for them in a confused manner? What if the application is neither made nor valid due to incapacity? Is a conditional application considered valid? And whether an application made for a reward offered is illicit and invalid? Whether on the day of committal to the tomb a Mass can be applied for particulars out of stipend P? Concerning the privileged altar. Q. 1, Is a Mass for Requiem required for such Indulgences to be obtained? Question 2.

How is to be understood the clause "Modò" in Ecclesia quotidianely diciuntur septem Missae? Qu. 3. How is to be understood the clause: Modò in Ecclesia non sit aliud Altare Privilegiatum? Resp. The priest alone performs this validly through his own intention, because it is an act of sacerdotal power.

Commn. : 19 » 8. 10 n. 5ii etc. Unde résolves. » 1. It is validly applied, even though it involves sinning by sacrificing or applying against the will of the superiors. Thus » from » Ledes.., and others, whose opinion Diana considers probable, » she says in t. 14 R. 72. It is asked whether a Religious duly applies Mass contrary to the will of the Prelate?

The first opinion denies what Scotus holds in Question 20. Gav. in Rubr. item Gabr. Serious, and Cordova, and 14 R. 72, who considers it probable. Reason, because Reason, because the Religious is subject to the will of the Superior. The Religious is subject to the will of the Superior; whence, if- 196 'Lib. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. Thus, if the superior can irritate the contract and the vows subject to him, similarly also the applications of Masses. The second opinion, however, more common and probable states that such a subjection application is indeed illicit, but not invalid, and this they hold with Busemb. . 76 3. g. Lugo de Eucharist. d. 19 n. 211. qui ait, oppositam rejici ferè ab omnibus Recentioribus, . 180. cum Mastrio, Croix, et Gob.

Reason, because the subject, when he partakes by virtue of the Order's power (as is the case here), is minimally subjected to the will of the Prelate. Marchantius limits himself in the third question of the second discussion. If a priest were to make application according to the force of the pact initiated with the offerer, because the pact is congruent, the application without the will of the Prelate is null, thus also the application. This nevertheless is to be rightly understood, when the subject so arranges the application of the pact that he absolutely intends not to apply it if the obligation contracted is not fulfilled (which indeed rarely happens in fact); but when he nevertheless applies it absolutely without restricting his intention to the satisfaction of the pact, then he validly applies it by virtue of the general power which he has to apply the Sacrifice as he wishes, even though through a mistaken belief he applies the Mass for the contracted obligation. Sacrificium, quod neque formaliter, neque virtualiter ulli applicantum est, vel ante, vel in ipsa consecratione, saltem secundae specifici, non potest postea ulli applicari, saltem adequatè, quia pro-ducit effectum; quandò existit, neque is suspen-di-tur; ideoque nec fiet accipere stipendium pro Missa præterita.

See. 5 t. 5 c. 2. » I have said, or even before; because it is not required that the application be made in the very Sacrifice: sufficient if it has been done the day before, although on that same day it does not occur to him. . c. R. 47 contra Vasq. It is asked I. Whether an application is sufficient for the celebration of Mass, namely one that has been habitually present at some time and not revoked? They deny that according to Vasquez of the Sacraments, in Decree 38, Chapter 6, Capital III, it suffices for applying Mass 'habitual application', namely one that has been habitually present and not revoked.

Dub. H. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 797 n. 74. and. Abelly concerning the Sacrifice says that what is required for consecration must either actually or at least virtually be intended by the Ministers, so that it may be applied to the fruit to be obtained. But more truly and commonly they affirm 17 Sass. 3 concl. 2.

Bonaventura de Sacramento, distinguis primam, quaestio unica, secunda partis tertii, secta tres, numerus undecim. Lugo idem titulus. D. 8 n. 93. with 6 Responsum ad 2. 9. You will say, 118 n. 174. Mazz. de Sacr.

Sporer ibidem, n. 340, cum Gob., qui testatur hanc esse omnium praxis; et Croix I, 6, p. 2, n. 50, cum Con., nam licet requirat intentionem virtualem; tamen illa virtualis (modo quo ipse explicat) coincidit cum nostra habituali; dum inquit, si quis acceptaverit viginti eleemosynas, hodie celebrationem in capite cum voluntate sequentibus diebus celebrant di pro offerente, tunc sufficit prima intentio etiamsi caeteris singulis diebus alia re distractas illam non renovet. Our reason is that the application of the Mass has the mode of a verbal donation, which having been made once suffices until it is expressly revoked. It is responded to the opposite reason, namely that in the Sacraments it is required an actual or virtual intention because intention makes the Sacrament; or actually contributes to its confession; but in the application of the Mass, intention does not produce the fruit thereof, since the fruit arises without application from the celebration of the Mass; and thus at times the application is made by which the fruit was given to someone. It is asked II. Whether, if one receives a stipend from ten persons for ten Masses, he satisfies by applying the first ten Masses, which he reads, to themselves in confusion?

Sylvius denies it. Bon. d. 4 p. 7 § 3 n. 1 et 38: Sed: melius videtur sic distinguendum: Si singula Sacrificia applicantur singulis indeter-minatè, non videtur satisfieri, quidquid dicant p. 2 n. 309. Reason, as regards rg8..... Lh. VI. Treatise.

III. Regarding the Eucharist, there is required an intention to apply the fruit determined for a specified person, so that he might consecrate congruously who would offer ten forms of consecration upon ten hosts, with the intention of consecrating each form one host from them in the mixture; thus, whoever applies ten Masses indeterminately. Si vero Sacerdos unamquamque Missam interdere applicare omnibus illis decem personis singulis appli- cando decimam partem uniuscujusque Missae non videtur ratio cur non satisfaciat cum nemo dubitet quin fructus Sacrificii sit divisibilis et ideo tribuitur unicuique quod debetur unusquisque in

singulis Missis decimam partem accipiendo in celebratione decimae Missae jam totum suum fructum per- cipit. And thus Bonaventura holds in I. c. Tamb; de Miss. I. 2 c. 2 § 11 n.4. item Aver. Hienae; and others at Croix 1. 6 p; 2 n. 210, against Pasqual. et et Possev. 336. 3.

If it is applied to one who is neither capable nor applicable, the fruit: ma-..... -..... does not enter the treasury of the Church, as Suarez teaches, or ce-..... •..... •..... ••.....•..... •••.....••..... • •.....•.....••..... •.....•..... 337..... a 4. Application under condition already fulfilled is..., ..., from ... e.g. to intention, which it had today ..., n ..., S ..., T ..., U ..., I ..., P ..., R ..., G ..., H ..., J ..., K ..., L ..., M ..., N ..., O ..., Q ..., R ..., S ..., T ..., U ..., V ..., W ..., X ..., Y ..., Z ..., a ..., b ..., c ..., d ..., e ..., f ..., g ..., h ..., i ..., j ..., k ..., l ..., m ..., n ..., o ..., p ..., q ..., r ..., s ..., t ..., u ..., v ..., w ..., x ..., y ..., z ..., aa ..., bb ..., cc ..., dd ..., ee ..., ff ..., gg ..., hh ..., ii ..., jj ..., kk ..., ll ..., mm ..., nn ..., oo ..., pp ..., qq ..., rr ..., ss ..., tt ..., uu ..., vv ..., ww ..., xx ..., yy ..., zz ..., aaa ..., bb ..., aa ..., cc ..., aa ..., dd ..., aa ..., ee ..., aa ..., ff ..., aa ..., gg ..., aa ..., hh ..., aa ..., ii ..., aa ..., jj ..., aa ..., kk ..., aa ..., ll ..., aa ..., mm ..., aa ..., nn ..., aa ..., oo ..., aa ..., pp ..., aa ..., qq ..., aa ..., rr ..., aa ..., ss ..., aa ..., tt ..., aa ..., uu ..., aa ..., vv ..., aa ..., ww ..., aa ..., xx ..., aa ..., yy ..., aa ..., zz ..., aa ..., aaa ..., bb ..., aa ..., cc ..., aa ..., dd ..., aa ..., ee ..., aa ..., ff ..., aa ..., gg ..., aa ..., hh ..., aa ..., ii ..., aa ..., jj ..., aa ..., kk ..., aa ..., ll ..., aa ..., mm ..., aa ..., nn ..., aa ..., oo ..., aa ..., pp ..., aa ..., qq ..., aa ..., rr ..., aa ..., ss ..., aa ..., tt ..., aa ..., uu ..., aa ..., vv ..., aa ..., ww ..., aa ..., xx ..., aa ..., yy ..., aa ..., zz ... 'kk aa ll mm nn oo pp qq rr hh jj kk ll mm nn mm aa aa cc aa dd ee ff gg hh ii jj kk ll mm nn oo pp qq rr hh jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg hh ii jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg hh ii jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg hh ii

hh ii jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg hh ii jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg hh ii jj kk ll mm nn aa aa dd aa ee ff gg Dub. II.

Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. truly truly very dear; or he who shall die first; or he who offers the reward stipendium; from such 79 s. 9 c, c. R. 15 Card. de Lugo d. 19 n. 209. against Boni. qu. ult. p. 7 § 5, who nevertheless himself dissuades in practice. 5. Not sufficient those made, who thinking you to be dead, mis- » 6. The priests of the Society do not suffice, celebrating - Bread for the dead by anticipation, unless tainted.

Even though men may have died already, even if decrees are promulgated afterwards. 9. They say Lugo de Pcen., d. 13 n. 137. et . 6, that the application of the Mass made on behalf of one who has already died is valid, but illicit by reason of the prohibition of Clement VIII., which was promulgated by Paul V. on November 15, 1605, vetoing this custom; 'as being dangerous to many names.' Subject to fiduciary scandal and excessively deviating from the ancient custom of the Church. At probabilibus (ut recte ait Croix n. 222.) talis application non solum erit illicita, sed saepe invalida, quia saepe accidet; quod Missa tunc dictatur pro causa, qua nondum existit, puta si stipendium offerens postulabit Missam pro proliferatione carcereorum & carcerationibus, ab infirmitate, etc. quae causa, cum hunc non adsit, effectus Missae suspensus remanere deberet, quod non videtur credibile. However, Tournel and p. 791 with Vasquez have rightly noted.

Aversa, et Quarti, quod si Sacerdos praevideat, quod postulandae sint Missae pro aliquo defuncto, bene possit eas nunc offerre, et deinde stipendium percipere, quia hoc casu jam offerentur pro persona determinata. 1. Not all Priests are bound on the day of Souls to apply Mass for all the dead. Ep. sacr. c. 3 §. 2 contra praxim, et » 3. Concerning this, there is a Decretal from the Sacred Congregation, as found in Merati's index under number 411, edited on August 4, 1663, where it was stated.

On the day of the Contemporarioris, the sacrifices of all faithful defuncts can be applied at the will of the celebrating priests, namely either for all the deceased, or perhaps for some few: This is De- 290.... Lib. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

Tourn says well in his fifth tome, page 793, question two: "given the consecration, there is nothing to prevent a stipend from being accepted for such Masses." 339. "8." The Mass celebrated in a privileged altar for the dead does not suffrage them, nor does the Indulgence suffice, unless it be for rest [or repose]. R. 233. ex declaratione. R. 8.

This privilege of the altar consists in this, that the soul is freed from Purgatory by the indulgences or fruits which are in the treasury of the Church, when Mass is applied at that altar; and this can be done through the power of the keys with which the Pope applies indulgences, freeing the living in a manner of absolution, and the dead through the manner of suffrage or solution. You inquire i. Is it always required for an altar to have a privilege in order to gain Indulgences, that Mass be celebrated de reque? Resp. negativè, nam licet olim anno MDLXI die I Junii respondisset S. C. affirmativè, ut fert 4. Resp. 233.

However, Alexander VII on January 22nd in the decree incipiente Credita nobis declared that during those days when Masses for the repose are prohibited, and during which Masses for a feast are being celebrated, they shall have Indulgences which Masses for the repose have: And this is extended to privileged altars not perpetually, but for some day in the week. Then Innocentius XI declared on May 4th in the year 1688, that it would be presumed valid on Sundays, and on days within the octaves of Paschaltide, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and other annual days on which Masses for the repose cannot be celebrated. Then Clement XI confirmed all these decrees on the 29th day (See Decreta praelata apud Merati t. 1 p. 2 Indicis n. 623, 624 et 625.) From all these things it is gathered that Masses in a privileged altar, or granted perpetually, or temporarily, confer indulgences on the dead, whether they be said for rest, or for the current day, when it is not permitted to say them for rest. Si vero currat festum semiduplex, omnino debet dici de requiem in altari Privilegiato; alias non acquiritur Indulgentia, etiamsi in Ecclesiæ solemnitas celebretur, ex decreto. Chapter III.

Doubt. Second. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 201 tione, S. C., which refers P. Zaccharia according to Croix l. 6 p. 2 ad n. 500: but when the privilege is granted for a term of time, the S. C. (in the Decree which Croix presents l. 6 p. y n. 525) declared that the time should begin not from the day of publication of the Brief, but from the day of its granting? You inquire about two. What if in the Church, where an Altar has been granted a Privilege for some time, seven or five Masses are not said according to the clause which is usually appended in Indulgences?

Sylvius in Croix n. 522 put forth that a privilege is also extended to suffrage even if two or three Masses are not read. But the contrary is more correctly taught by Benedict XIV, Notif. 56 n. 16 ex Decreto S. C. Concilii, published on the aforementioned day, that the celebration of Masses indulted with the aforementioned indulgences is absolutely necessary every single day in the same Church. She declared nevertheless the same

Sacred Congregation on July 30, 1706, in another Decree (inserted in the Bullarium of Clement XI., p. 2, p. 592), that for a time, when Religious or Secular Priests do not celebrate the said Indulgences for some days or weeks because of absence, they should not lose them, but then suspend them. Furthermore, it was declared that, if Masses are not read on account of the infirmity of the priests, or because Religious ought to celebrate them elsewhere by reason of festal occasions or funerals at the command of the Prelate, and this happens rarely, nevertheless suffrages of indulgences are also granted. See the aforementioned Decrees among Bened.

XIV 1. cited n. 17. and see Sporer t. 3 p. 258. who extends that in full. You will inquire 3. how the clause is to be understood, if in the Church another clearly Privileged thing has not been erected? Sporer responds probably on page 258, note 133, and it should be understood thus: that if a privileged altar has previously been granted generically for whatever defective cases, and this is not expressly stated in the second petition, any subsequent generic grant will be null; but rather, if the grant is made for some particular individuals, then it will be valid. And thus it seems likewise to be said, namely, if the first concession were particular and the second general. Notandum est hoc, idque privilegium altaris privilegiati non committatur per communicationem generalis privilegiorum ex decreto sanctae congregationis indulgentiarum datum die quinto februarii anno millesimo septuagesimo quadragessoctavo et approbatum a beato.

XIV. die 2 martii ejusdem anni; thus it refers, P. Ferrariiis Indulgence in Append. hum. xv. To be noted 2ndly, that Clement XIII, in a previous desire of the same Sacred Congregation on May 19, 1719, granted an indulged privileged altar for all Parish Churches daily for seven years; and having this completed, commanded all Bishops, Abbots, and Vicars Capitulars to join their Parishes with the same privilege for seven years: see. Ferrer. Append. n. DUBIUM III. When and how often it is permissible to celebrate: Can Mass be said before the authority, or after midday? From what time does dawn begin? But what time is dawn morally equivalent to noon? Concerning privileges of Regulars? Cases in which it is permissible to celebrate before dawn or after midday.

Is it permissible to say all three Masses in the night before dawn? Is it lawful to anticipate or postpone Mass on account of festivity, journey, or by episcopal dispensation? Would a grave sin be committed by one who celebrates before dawn or after midday? What is the matter-of-fact smallness concerning this? What kind of sin would it be to celebrate the Matins aptly? If there were a conventual Mass and that of a solentis, could it be celebrated (and Holy Communion administered) on any day of the year? Is it lawful to privately celebrate in Cana and on Holy Saturday?

When and is it lawful to celebrate masses in the daytime? Could Mass ever be interrupted or begun with the people present? If a prince or company of pilgrims should come, or if the priest remembers some impediment? Chapter III. Dub. III. Exeunt Eucharistice; ut est sacrificium. Si autem urget necessitas propria vel aliena? Quomodo missa interrumpitur supplenda sit ab alio sacerdote? Respexit: Ordinariè non licet celebrare post meridiem, sed debet inchoari ante duodecimam; nec ante auroram, quàm ante ortum solis, regìaque horæ: horam cum quadrante; et poss. sesquihoram comprehendere diem, et consequenter, cum secundùm Henriq.

'Suarez, et alios, Missa possit inchoari tantó antè auroram, ut sub ejus initium finiatur licet duabus horis ante ortum solis iueipere.' Thus Rodríguez, and others. Whereupon certain ones infer in reply: that what the Cardinal says... Dionysius: but rather at two hours after midnight, Cardinal: Dionysius loc. cit. Whatever hour, however, licitly (whether with or without a privilege), they celebrate, let it be presumed and accordingly.

Mass, which at night. Nati-vitatis, cæterisque, cæterisque; quæ post illam celebrantur, licere iis Eucharistiam aliis ministrare, contra Bordinum docet Diana p. 9 t. 7 R: 43. * (Sad hoc extium nunc est; Vide: de hoc d: n. '252. v. If so also. * » In the Rubric of the Missal, no. XV: it is stated: Private Mass; can be said at any hour from sunrise to midday after Matins and Lauds, whatever the time may be. It is not therefore licit to celebrate before dawn, which no longer signifies the rising of the sun, but that time which is midway between night and day. Hence they say 33, it is licit to begin Mass about two hours before the rising of the sun: but rather they add Croix L. 6 p. 1 n. 226.

XIV. Notif. 12 n. 12, auroram computandam esse ram: ex temporum varietate; juxta tabellas, quae directoriis Officii divini apponi solent. Therefore Croix and Tournely assert that the dawn should be reckoned to begin about two hours before sunrise in the month of June: in February, September, and March, about one and a half hours before sunrise; in the month of March, about one hour and a quarter before sunrise: but in all other months, about one hour and three-quarters before sunrise. All however agree on this from Lugo d. 20. m. 37- Wigandt tract. 15 n. 52. c. 4 n. 33 et 42 who cite it. Sa.

Henry and others, that it is improper to conclude Masses at dawn and begin them shortly before midday; reason, because the time both of dawn and of midday (of which we shall speak infra n. 345) should not be understood mathematically, but morally. And although formerly (as Benedict relates), XIV.) Clement XI subsequently commanded in one of his edicts, where he said thus. We command that Masses may be begun by you

before dawn, and that they must be completely finished at midday; nevertheless afterwards, this point was again subjected to examination, having been commanded thus by Benedict. XIII. annuit, posse tolerari halimidinem tertiae partis hora. tum ante auroram, tum post mediam: idque per edictum publicatum fuit sub Clemente.

XII (among 342 Religious, Lugo affirms on the 20th day of the second month according to n. 27, that there are further Privileges by which Regulars are permitted to celebrate [Mass] two hours after midnight: similarly IV cel. « brandi tertià horà post meridiem ex justa causa. Whether such privileges were revoked by Tridentine? Fagundez and others affirm apud Lugo n. 20, because in the aforementioned Council session 22. It is omitted. From the view. For celebration. Masses are thus commanded: Ordinaries... take care, that Priests celebrate not others, than at the proper hours... without impediment.

Privileges... with whichsoever ones. At, they deny, Wigandt tract. 15 n. 4. Lugo ibid. with 8 with Tambur. Reason, because at Trent it imposes upon Bishops merely that they should see to the observance of the aforesaid; therefore where Bishops do not resist, there is no reason why Regulars should not enjoy their privileges, Cap. Hl. Doubt.

III. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, they cannot be. But notwithstanding this, the contrary must be held entirely according to the Decree of Clement XI published on 15 non obstantibus (as above) against any Privileges whatsoever. "I have said, orderly,' because it is permissible to anticipate subsequent cases in which a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a

presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases, in which also even a presumption was made shortly after midday, in such cases. C. Priests celebrate Masses. But rather this should be denied according to reason, because this would be contrary to the express rubric of the Missal, where it is noted: For the first Mass in the night; for the second...at dawn; for the third...in the day.

And today there is a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, issued on April 20, 1641, in which it is stated: In the night of the Nativity of the Lord, after the first mass has been sung, no other mass can immediately be celebrated under any circumstances, nor can the faithful be allowed to communicate. Si autem quis unam Missam celebrare vellet talie die, nulla apparet ratio, cur primam potius quam alias celebrare debeat, ut recte ait P. Concin. Addi posse est celebrari Missam privatam post solemnum in festivitate, si solemnis protrahatur ad horam et amplius post meridiem, ut probabiliter dicit Wigandt t. 15 n. 52. et cum . Vasq. Son. Add 6. The cause of traveling during an hour after midday (or before dawn), as stated by Wigandt in loc. cit., and as held by Soto, . . Thus the presumed cause of some great man's death, namely; n. 41, with Wigandt.

Cause of public supplication, Busemb. and Concim. Item when the Bishop confers Orders, n. 40. with Soto, S. Anton. Mire. Si Episcopus dispenset in aliquo casu particulari ex rationabili causa; juxta quam facultatem episcopi possunt secum praesumptum dispensare. Thus Lugdunum d. 20 n. 27.

Wig. 1. c. . 28 Cap. III. Dnb. II. Of the Eucharist, since it is a Sacrifice. 309 and 37, with reference to p. 6 n. 225, all superiors possess the same ability, secluded by privilege, towards their Religious subjects, as they are their Ordinaries. « 1. He gravely sins who without any of these or at least just cause, sooner, or more seriously celebrates after a prolonged fast, where.

» See where he notes that Religious can celebrate up to three hours after midday using their own privileges, but after third hour [of the day] never under any circumstances. See Bon. » 1. c. » It is asked whether it is lawful for each to celebrate Mass before the ninth hour, that is, after the third hour after midday? Scotus and Saint Anthony affirm. Mire.

Navar. 21 n. 354, qui cum; quia (ut dicunt) sacrificium altaris debet correspondere sacrificio crucis, quod horà nonà fuit consummatum. They

also do not consider that the Church's contrary custom should be obstructed, because this has been introduced merely on account of the weakness of men who did not long continue fasting; whence it is not deemed to have imposed an obligation, but rather a favor; which anyone may renounce. But today it must be altogether held contrary, as they teach in section 8, chapter 4, note 1 and 7. Palaus loc. cit., qui opinionem contrariam merito improbatam vocat, et Ratio eruitur tum ex 22 in Decreto de Observand. in cel. Miss. etc., ubi sic habeatur: decernit Sancta Synodus.... ut ordinarii.... edicto et paenis propositis caveant ne sacerdotes aliis quam dictis heribus celebrent.

Then from the universal custom of the Church, which certainly must now be observed, since it is prescribed by the Rubric of the Missal as mentioned above, and moreover expressly approved by Saint Pius V in his Bull beginning SS. in Christo Pater, where the Pontiff prohibits through the virtue of obedience, that anyone presume to celebrate vespers under the penalty of perpetual suspension from the divine services for any pretext whatsoever, whether of canonical or other kind. Therefore, celebration under vespers will not be excused on account of a grave fault, since such celebration is declared to be presumptuous by the Pontiff and constitutes an evident disobedience. Generally however, the Fathers admit a slight matter which excuses from mortal sin; and they assign a venial cause, namely, if Mass be terminated somewhat before dawn and begin somewhat after midday: but they greatly differ in assigning such a matter as grave. In the third part of question five, chapter ten, he assigns one-third of an hour as grave; half an hour is more commonly and more probably considered by Sylvius in article two of question eighty-three, and others consider it not to be a grave matter unless Mass begins before dawn or after midday. Item valde probabiliter dicunt hic 80 s. 4. v. Thirdly, Merati p. 248, and Fill. tr. 5 c. 4. q. 7 n. 103, together with others, hold that the privilege of celebrating Mass after midday or before dawn is to be understood as one hour before or after the time previously conceded by the Doctors as presumptuous, not privileged; otherwise the privilege would profit little. But concerning the aforementioned small matter (that is, less than an hour, as mentioned above) in celebrating after midday, someone recently said that it does not suffice to excuse a deferral of the celebration until that time on account of a venial cause; rather, a just cause for celebrating at that moment is also required, such as if it is a feast day, or so that others may hear Mass, and similar reasons. Otherwise he said, the celebration would not be excused by venial fault.

But this distinction or opinion has been handed down by no Author, and it seems altogether insubstantial to me and to others learned, because the same cause which permits a delay also permits what is presumptuously

allowed, namely, that the celebration take place then. It is not a sin to celebrate before the said Prime, or even if by infirmity you are unable to discern hours * (as the presumptuous teach in Cap. III). Dub. II. Be Euchar., ut est Sacrificium. 209 ». communi); vel praesumptum ante Matutinum, si causa subst, sine qua erit veniale, ut docent Fill. . Quæritur, quale peccatum sit celebrare Missam ante recitationem Matutini?

There are three opinions: The first states it to be a mortal sin, and this is feared according to 6. 13 c. 6. Antoine p. 154 v. Secondarily, 1 and others with what I sent to Merati, t. 1, pag. 799 n. 7, say that Gav. later elsewhere tempered his own opinion. The aforementioned authors approve this opinion from 635, where it is stated: Priests, before they have completed the morning office, must not presume to celebrate Masses. Item ex rubrica Missalis titulus unus de praeparatione.

Sac. ubi legitur: Sacerdos celebraturus Missam.... saltem Mututino cum Laudibus absoluto etc. Item tit. 10 de defect. ubi videtur hic numerari inter defectus graviores. The second opinion does not acknowledge any guilt in this matter, and they hold this view. Mass. I. I c. 7 § 2 n. 3. Holz m. t. 1 p. 447 n. 469. with Gob. and Cherub. also March. et Quarti according to Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 230. The reason for these matters is that no law appears concerning guilt prescribing this; and the rubric is merely about counsel, not about a precept.

The third opinion, however, is more common and probable, which they hold: part. 10, n. 14; c. cap. 37, n. 81; 6; Merati: 1. c. Tourn. 1. c., with Soto, Sylv. Bellarm. Henry of St. Ignatius Croix 1. c. with Val. c. 4 n. 45. cum. Sylv. Barbosa, etc., teaches against the first point, that this is not truly mortal sin; firstly, because there is no connection between the Office and the Mass, and therefore the recitation of Matins does not seem to be a necessary disposition for celebrating, since the priest can also prepare himself otherwise by prayer; secondly, because such a serious obligation is neither expressed in the rubric nor commonly received under a grave burden. It teaches however against the second opinion, that this is not excused from venial fault, because in the rubric it is already numbered among deficiencies; for those things which are reckoned among deficiencies cannot any longer be matters of counsel, and therefore they cannot be immune from any fault.

This our opinion is embraced by the presumed N. P. Benedictus XIV. in his most learned work on the Sacrifice. Missing reference: 1: 3 c. 13. From this kind of venial fault, however, as rightly say Tourn. in the cited work, question 5. Croix l. cit., et excusabit quaecunque mediocriter causata ratio habens, puta si postulet eleemosynam dans, ut celebretur statim, si

expectet populus aut aliqua persona gravis, si præcipiat superior tempus celebrandi, vel instet commoditas studii, itineris, et similia. 348 An vero sit mortale canere Missam conventualem et solemnem antequam Matutinum dicatur in choro? Denies he who writes in librum 7 caput 2 decretum 39.

But. Bened. XIV. l. c. et cum . et alios communiter et verius affirmant esse mortale nisi intercedat justa causa (et gravis, et publica, ac sine scandalo ut addit; ita ut, aliter agendo, graviter laederetur publicus cultus Dei, bonum commune, et conveniens regimen Ecclesiæ praeter scandalum populi. 349 v Resp. 2. Literally speaking, it is permitted to celebrate daily. I say, per se, because the binding precept obliges under mortal sin; therefore we are prohibited from celebrating on the holy day of Friday *(And the Sabbath, by cons.*).

» In the third question, where it is said that during these two days the Sacraments are entirely not to be celebrated; and with respect to this two-day period, certainly remains in observance among all, that is, on the Paschal Eve and the holy Sabbath); nevertheless, to receive the Eucharist or to give it to others is not forbidden, as Hurt. de sacrif. 4 d. dif. 3 states. Quintan. ex non licere ministrare, nisi solis infirmis, velit Gav. etc. (Notan- Cap. III. Dub. III. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 211 While this Decree has been approved for daily communion by Innocent.

XI. relative to the Cross l. 6 p. 1 n. 665, in which it is said: Let the presumption (of bishops and parochial priests) be such that regarding communion on weekdays vi. Prepare according to the Missal rubrics, and observe the usage of the Roman Church. From which correctly inserts Cardinal among Croix ibidem. n. 493. (whatever Leand. doubts) now seriously to be prohibited from privately presumptuously communicating on that day. In Coena Domini vero, etiam ex consuetudine, uno ccele- » bratione, reliqui communicare debeant; plures tamen ex causa licite privatim celebrant, non tamen post finitam Missam solemnem et sacrarium reconditum, ut vult; tr. 22 disp. un. p. 7 n. 2, licet alii id non admittant apud de Sabbato sancto; alii negant licere, ut, 4 dif.

3. de Lugo, s. 1, n. 18, qui addit: non esse tunc legendas prophetias, quia non sunt pars Missae; neque benedictionem Cerei, imò nec Litanias, quia est ratio eadem. See 1. cit. n. 20. and Bon p. 2, where he notes that this usage has little significance. See the presumptuous 4 R. 237, where Mercero permits others to celebrate on that day before the solemn Mass, either with Sanctus incident or stipendium for the Sacred, to say Mass for the dead, votive, or in this altar or that one, as he who offers money requests (yet only within the limits permitted by the rubrics; when these are neglected, it is not fitting to invert the order of the Church for

another's devotion). It is asked whether it is permissible to celebrate privately during the Lord's Supper and on Holy Saturday? They affirm. 5 art. 6 n. 1. Diana page 6, translation 6, R. 19.

Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 231 et 234 cum . . 4 n. 2 et 7, qui huic opinioni adhaerent. However, in opposition to the Decretals, the Sacred Congregation responded that either they are not everywhere published, or not everywhere received. The same northerly direction, formerly presumptuously adhered to by me, but now, having observed the most recent Decretals issued, I absolutely hold that it is not permissible, as Antoine p. 490 q. 4 and Bened. hold. XIV. For the holy Sabbath there is a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (found in the title 15 among Monacelli).

Form. 3 in fine) edited on March 11, 1600, where it was stated thus: It is not permissible to celebrate Masses on Holy Sabbath day in any Church or Oratory, notwithstanding any contrary custom, provided that the Pope approves his General Decree to this effect, the same Sacred Congregation having also decreed concerning the day of Jupiter sanctus another Decree prohibiting it, reported by Pittonius de Sed quod magis refert; all these Decrees were expressly confirmed by Pope Clement XI. (as may be read in the aforementioned Benedict). XIV. d. c. n. 1703) per Decreto proprio ipsius Pontificis emanatum die 15 Martii an. 1712 ubi sic habetur: Dichiarando per ultimo che colla suddetta prohibitione per lo Venerdì santo non intende la Santità sua di permellere, che ne' giorni di Giovedì e Sabbato Santo si celebrino Messe private, ma solo la Conventuale, secundum il Rito della S. Chiesa, e replicati Decreti della S. C. de' Merati in indice XI (vide ibid n. 632) à quo statuit fuit ut occurrenti festo SS. Only on the feast of the Annunciation or of St. Joseph at the Lord's Supper shall some private masses be celebrated, according to the judgment of the bishop: therefore priests shall not celebrate such a mass outside this case on that day. His igitur stantibus Decretis, non video quomodo opinio contraria hodie sustineri possit. However, when the Feast of St. Joseph and the Annunciation occur.

At the Lord's Supper, the Bishop will take care that some private Masses be celebrated before the solemn one; but if the Feast of B. occurs. V. occur the Sabbath holy, private masses cannot be celebrated, and the feast is transferred to a feria two days after Sunday in albis, according to the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation among Merati's works, volume 1 page 2 in Index number 50t and 504 and number 632. "Resp. 3. it is not permitted oftener on a day to ordain"; which I add because, if you are fasting, it is permissible in the following cases, twice or presumptively three times, provided that, if easily obtainable, the judgment of the

bishops is required, except for precepts. • 1. Night of the Nativity, although it is not observed, lest the parish priest celebrate, Chapter III. Dub. II.

Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice, one may indeed celebrate three Masses, but he can omit any other for discretion's sake. Diana p. 4 t. 4 R. 236. Neither to communicate three times, nor once, and to celebrate "twice," p. 8 t. 1 R. 87. » 2. If the Pastor have two Dissipated Parishes, Fill.

Card. de Lugo, n. 46. Now let it not be another who may conveniently celebrate in the other [parish], as this is also according to the Decree N. P. of Benedict XIV published on the 16th day of March 1746 (See in his Bullarium t. r), where it is prohibited for a parish priest, both on account of poverty, to celebrate twice in one feast; and only that is conceded if there be not another Priest who can celebrate in the other Parish. They say the same thing: when Et hoc is also allowed on a feria day, so that the people (sufficient in number) do not miss Mass, Suarez says this 14. Since Benedict absolutely condemns that. XIV. de Sacr. Mass. lib. 3 cap. 5 num. 3 cum Decl.

The same Blessed refers to that. XIV. Omission. Where it is said: Excepting the day of the Lord's Nativity, unless necessity prompts otherwise, a Priest suffices to celebrate once in a day..... And the Glossa v. Necessitatis, dicit: Si celebravit missam de die, potest et aliam missam recitare pro defuncto.

And he admitted this opinion, Bened. XIII. In Sermon 6 de (See in Bullario Tomo II.) there, in § Nevam, near the end, he declared while standing that it can be permitted for the parish priest to transfer the celebration of Mass for the people on a Sunday to another day within the same week, but not more than this. The Dominica are carried out. These are the words of the Pontiff: Nor indeed are these things now remembered to us, as though two Masses could still be celebrated by the same cleric at present, with the body present, according to the current discipline, a presbyter being permitted to celebrate Mass for the dead if the corpse is left from the previous day's Mass, and to chant it. « 3. If the concourse of people is so great that the Church cannot contain it, as it is said: "5 t. 5 c. 4 n. 6."

See C. de Lugo I, cited, even though it is now more fitting to celebrate outside. (With Suarez, Conc.) </> </> 4. If before ablution he is advised to communicate with the sick person and has already received his own hostia, and there is no other Priest Sylv., C. de Lugo says d. 20 n. 44. (Aut viz practicum, ut) » » 5. practicum, ut » » 5. If on a feast day persons come who it does not displease Sacred to omit, for example,

King, or prince. »: « (Or Bishop, as S. n. 19 holds against those who consider it probable that all deny this), although this is said to be the last one and is not in use. See Bon. d. 4 q. ult. p. 7 n. 9. C. de Lugo 1. c. et ubi rectè monet; in his omnibus attendendum ad loci consuetudinem, quæ ferè omnes nunc sustulerit. * (Ut etiam) * 352 Quæres, an aliquando liceat interrumpere Mis- sam? » 2, tamen accidentaliter abrumpere vel etiam interrumpere aliquid interponendo licet his casibus.

Here it must be noted that to mutilate a sacrifice on purpose is never allowed, even to avoid death; but to mutilate by accident, and indirectly, may sometimes be permitted, for instance, due to an overwhelming fire or enemy attack. Cap. III. Dub. II. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 215 for then the Priest could take the consecrated Host and carry with him the chalice without consecrating it: because then he does not mutilate the sacrifice, but is excused from completing that. Ita 3 q. 3 p. 2. c. 4 n. 103 cum Garcia Arav. et communiter.. » 1.

For the one who is fasting after the Gospel or procession to be received. » 2. At the advent of the Prince in grace, or on the festal day for the peregrination, when otherwise they could not hear Mass, or by a similar just cause; from which, if there has not been made an offering, it is possible to begin anew, so that the entire Sacred Rite may be heard * (Cum . . 4 n. 111. And the same can happen upon the arrival of a Bishop, a Cardinal, or during a procession of the people. DD. cited) * although they are not bound, various Authors teach with Sa, according to Bon., last dist., p. 7 n. 9, who well advises that custom of places be maintained.

However, Henryq. teaches that it is permissible only for a finite epistle or gospel. . 3. If before the Canon the Priest remembers some impediment, for example, that he is not fasting, or in grace, or irregular, or excommunicated. * (Indeed even Thomas and the common opinion agree;) now it may be left that the Mass be given over without scandal or grave note (as well doth the Council advert). If indeed he presume to be excused from being tolerated as one not excommuni cated, nor capable of being dismissed, 4. If there is a pressing necessity, whether one's own, such as a severe illness, e.g., 354; or that of another person, such as when someone who is about to die needs to be baptized or absolved. In other Sacraments however, which are not so necessary, it is not seemly to interrupt the consecration and reception, unless one were about to die within five days, nor would there be need to lay aside one’s clothes; or unless one could not receive the Sacrament of Penance through frenzy. Returning again to the Sacrifice, if it had been previously accomplished, according to Lib. 216.

VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist. Consecration will begin where it

was lacking; if it has not been performed and a brief delay has intervened, for example.

» less than one hour; but if longer, it will be begun anew. . c. exped. sacr. c. 8. » § 7. How is the Mass, which has been interrupted by one priest and continued by another, to be supplemented? If the Priest should fail in the consecration, nothing ought to be supplied by another, according to Croix n. 547 cum 8. The manner in which a Mass begun by one Priest and interrupted by another is to be completed.

If however a deficiency occurs after consecration, namely in respect to the species of one only, then the priest should fast if he is present; otherwise, even if not fasting, he should supplement it because of the greater precept concerning the integrity of the Sacrifice. Thus it is cited. All things have regard to the Red. And even a priest who has been excommunicated and declared irregular must supply if others are lacking, and he himself can do so even with grave inconvenience, as Croix says in n. 550; but contrary to this is Croix n. 548. He says; but probably, if the Sacrifice could be supplied by the same Priest, this would be better than to have it supplied by another, even though that other one might not be fasting.

Croix cum DUBIUM IV. Quo loco celebrandum sit? 356 An et in qua necessitate licet extra Ecclesiam celebrare? Et an in mari? 357 An et quando licet celebrare in Oratoriiis ex dispensatione Episcopi? It is permitted in blessed oratories, and in oratories of communities. III. in Oratoriiis erected in Palatiis Episcoporum. Chap. III. Dub.

IV. Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice: Can bishops celebrate in private houses? Can they dispense so that what is fittingly celebrated in those places may be adequately provided for? Not. I. The privilege does not perish through the death of the Pope or anything, if the one privileged changes his residence?

Not. III. On what days is it not permitted to celebrate in private chapels? And whether Regulars or Bishops can celebrate in private houses, except for the Mass granted by indult? Whether Religious can celebrate according to privilege in a house that carries a portable altar? Whether those celebrating mortally in the violated Church always sin mortally? And do they incur some penalty? Whether the chapels are defiled if not blessed?

And concerning the Sacristy, Crypt, etc.? 363 To whom does the Church owe reconciliation? 364 How must the crime be notorious by which the Church or the Cenacle is polluted? When does the Church become polluted

through homicide? If a wound is inflicted within her and death (or the effusion of blood) follows without? When does the Church become polluted through the effusion of blood or semen? When through burial of excommunicated persons, infidels, or heretics? When through the destruction of the Church? How shall execration be pronounced against that which is consecrated, namely, the Church, altars, chalices, and vestments? See concerning the degradation of the Church. Of the degradation of altars, and 1. If a stone be removed. 2.

If it be broken. 3. If the tomb is stripped. Dub. 1. Whether relics of saints are necessary for the consecration of altars. Dub. 2.

What, if the seal is broken or the tomb removed? Concerning the de-excommunication of the chalice. Dub. 1. Is the chalice to be excreated if the inauration is destroyed? Dub. 2. Is a new chalice that has been newly emptied in any way in need of consecration?

Dub. 3. Is it licit to celebrate using a chalice that has never been consecrated? 371 On the stripping off of vestments. « Resp. Commonly, it is not permitted to celebrate, except in a church that is consecrated or at least blessed and not profaned, nor execrated, nor interdicted. It is evident "from 20 n. 48." "I said, commonly: because in a fitting place and portable altar (which always requires something under the mortal), with the permission of the Bishop, whether he be present or absent, it is permitted for subsequent cases: outside which if it happens, to be mortal teach Fill. . and with the common) against Sot., and Sa."

Praemio, si sit necessitas, qualis est consideratus, I. If the Aruate Church should lack. * (And another people would lack Mass, and thus it is granted in Cap. We Grant concerning Con- secret. Dist. 1.) * II. If the people do not enter the temple on the feast day, * (n. 48 s. 2. Bened.

XIV. concerning when. "In camps for the army; but only on feast days." » Fag. C. de Lugo, etc., licet dicat 44: etiam non in festis diebus censeat posse permittere Generalibus et primariis Ducibus in suis tentoriis * (In his tamen et similibus casibus impetranda est semper ac potest licentia Ordinarii, ut Lugo dicit 20 d. num. 48. et cum ne navigantes qui navem deserere nequeunt Missa die festo priventur; n. 54. And although in c. Congruent, the Pontiff declares that it is not permitted to celebrate outside the Church except for the greatest necessity, nevertheless respond Salm n. 55. with and others that a lesser necessity suffices, from the received custom, as is in the aforementioned cases, which Lugo d. 20 d. n. 48. and Salm n. 51. add.

Notwithstanding, in a river or sea on account of the danger of the shedding of blood, according to common opinion. It is taught among the Bonites. However, it is now said to have the contrary practice of the Lusitanians traveling to India, by permission of Clement. VIII. and Pauli V, from which licitly Chapter III. Dub.

IV. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 219 "now to be made" according to de Lugo l.c. It is nevertheless limited 40. » with Hurt. Mercer. With that caution, it teaches that a presumptively Episcopal person can be conceded this faculty in necessity (for example, lest a large multitude not hear the Sacred Word, or a moribund person die without viaticum), according to c. contra Con. et Tur.

» (But Lugo approves it on the 20th day n. 86). Who alone reserves this to the Pope, so that where a presumptuous Bishop brings forward the Declaration of Cardinals, the Bishops are ordered to prohibit it. (And there is no need to doubt this, as we shall say shortly ex Tridertino, where it was entirely forbidden to Bishops not to grant the use of a portable altar and permission to celebrate outside the Church.) Surely it is certain with the obtained faculty from the Pontiff to allow celebration on the sea, not only because of the concession of Clement. VIII et Pauli V ut supra, sed etiam ob Indultum Clementis. XI ut referunt Benedicti. XIV » concerning the Sacrifice.

Miss. l. 3 c. 5. et quo concessum fuit Equitibus Hierosolymitani anno 1706 celebrare in mari; hac tamen lege: 1. ut adsit longa distantia à littore: 2. ut mare sit tranquillum: 3. ut assistat alius Sacerdos, vel Diaconus, qui si quis concitetur motus, calicem firmum teneat.) Secundo. By dispensation of the Bishops, on account of a reasonable cause, although they prohibit it generally, nevertheless in private oratories destined for divine worship, it is permitted, unless for just cause, even without benediction. But even this power is now denied them, teaches Gav. l. c. et 42., notwithstanding which they are able in some particular case, for just cause, to permit that it be celebrated outside the Church, on a portable altar; teaches the same in c. R. 41. from de Lugo, Aversa, Persic. etc. It is asked, in what private Oratories Bishops can grant permission to celebrate? Formerly, bishops were able to grant this license everywhere according to c. 12 of the Decretals, in the first question of the first distich on Consecration, where it is stated: We consider that the solemnities of Masses should not be celebrated everywhere, but only in places consecrated by the bishop, or where he himself has permitted. But this faculty was taken away from Bishops concerning private houses according to the Decree on Celebration.

Masses where such a statement was made: Neither should they endure in private houses and absolutely outside the Church, and oratories dedicated solely to divine worship, to be appointed and visited by those same ordinaries; and that holy sacrifice should not be celebrated by seculars or regulars with anyone whatsoever. Therefore, this Decree did not prohibit Bishops from granting permission to celebrate. I. In Oratorio benedicto et designato ad usus sacros, in quo est janua habens ingressum per viam publicam, etsi sit janua privata affixa domui alicujus secularis; illud praesumptum non dicitur privatum, sed publicum Oratorium, ut recte dicunt. 5 a. 6 n. 5. et Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 265. cum Aversa, Quarti, Naldo, Homob. et Dian, qui addit cum Pasq. posse in tali Oratorio nihilominus celebrari januis clausis: non enim praecipitur ut publico celebratur, sed ut in publico non esse opus quatuor muris, qui Oratorium separent ab aliis locis; sed posse pro quarto muro aptari telam, quae aperiatur ad conunoditatem audientium Missam. Therefore, whoever should take possession thereof or use it for other profane purposes as a habit, would commit a mortal sin, because that Oratory is truly a Church; yet venially, if ever, and without necessity, as the Doctors say. Bon. et Neque II.

In those Oratories erected in the houses of Regulars, or of another community, as rightly he says. Cel. Miss. l. 1 c. 4 § 3 n. 2. cum Lezana. Hence, it is rightly permissible for the Bishop to grant permission to celebrate in the Oratories of hospitals, seminaries, and conservatoria, as practice has established; for these houses are not considered private. And the same is said by Croix n. 264. cum Quarti, et Diana de Cupellis erectis in publicis carec- Cap. III.

Dub. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 221 ribus: for thus it is said by Illsung ap. Croix 1. 3 p. 1 n. 626. to look only at the prohibition of Tridentine in private orations of laics, or secular clerics. Hence Fagnanus in c. In his de refers, S. Congregationem pluris declarasse, Hujusmodi Oratoria.

Carcerum, Confraternitatum, Hospitalium, et Communitorum non comprehenduntur prohibitione Concilii, quia haec sunt Oratoria fixè ad divinum cultum dedicata. And therefore in such Oratories whoever hearing Mass satisfies, and from whatever Priest can certainly be celebrated Mass, and every day, presumptuously, according to the Declaration of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on September 2, 166 (as found in Merati where it was thus said: Mass may be offered as a public Sacrifice in an Oratory constructed with permission from the Bishop on solemn days of the year, provided that it has all requisites for either ecclesiastical or public Oratory to be constituted. Neither III. In Oratoriiis

erected in Palaces of Bishops, as commonly said by Merati ibidem n. 3. Renzius 1. 1 c. 3 q. 3i et Croix 1. c. In talibus enim Oratoriis omnes possunt celebrare, et praecepto Missae satisfacere, ut declaravit Sancta Congregatio Concilii die 22 septemb. 1640, apud 8 R. 40. in fine.

Reason, because the house of the Bishop is not considered private, since it enjoys ecclesiastical immunity, according to canon 36 where it is said: We have established what the Ecclesiastical Canons have decreed and the Roman Law has constituted, so that it must absolutely be permissible to withdraw from the atria of the Church or the house of the Bishop. Under which teaching Bened teaches. XIV. de Miss. lib. 3 c. 6. cum Brancatio et Clericis hujusmodi Oratoria Episcoporum et Cardinalium quoad celebrationem Missarum gaudere fere iisdem privilegiis quibus Ecclesiae conecratae. And they say the same: [Decretum] I, 6, n. 5, 8, R. 40, de domo rusticana, quam haberet Episcopus extra Diœcesim adhuc sine licentia Ordinarii et adhuc absente ipsa Episcopo, ut dixit; modo talis domus alteri non locetur; idque videtur admitti ab eadem declaratioue S. C. apud ut suprà, ubi dictum fuit, interessentes Sacrificio Missæ in privato Episcopi sacello satisfacere præcepto ecclesiastico tam in Dioccesi quam extra. 358 Sed dubitatur idem. Whether bishops can celebrate Mass or have it celebrated in houses where they find them, outside their own proper residence?

It is responded affirmatively from chapter last of Privilege in 6 where it is thus found: Because Bishops and their superiors frequently find themselves absent from their own Churches and Dioceses, they are not always able to conveniently go to Churches for celebrating or hearing Mass there without transgressing the law by passing through any day without a reasonable cause; therefore, we grant indulgence to them according to the present constitution so that they may have viaticum at an altar wherever they are, and celebrate or have celebrated Mass there, without violating any interdict. Et quavis causa concessionis hic sit sola absentia Episcopi à sua Ecclesia, tamen advertit rectè de Cel. concessionem esse univer- salis sine limitatione distantiae in textu expressæ. Neither hinders the Decree of Clement XI issued on December 15, 1703 (reported by Croix in book 6, page 2, note 258), where this faculty was removed from Bishops, with these words: To Bishops and Cardinals in no way is it permitted outside their own place of residence to erect an altar in the houses of laymen, or even within their own Diocese... to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass there, or have it celebrated there. Nam talia facultas restituta fuit Episcopis à Innocentio XIII die 3 maji 1723 in Bulla Apostolici ministerii: ubi dictum fuit: Huiusmodi prohibicio (scilicet facta Episcopis non celebrandi, sive non faciendi celebrari) intelligenda non est de domibus etiam laicis, in quibus dicti Episcopi fortè occasione visitationis vel internis

hospitio excipiuntur: ut nec etiam, quando Episcopi in casibus à jure permissis, vel de speciali sedis Apostolicæ licentia absentes à domo propriæ ordinariæ habitationis moram idcirco faciant in aliena domo per modum similis habitationis. Ita apud Merati t. 1 p. 2 Indice Hæcque Bulla confirmata fuit à Benedicto XIII. die 17 sept. 1724. in Constit. habita in Synodo Romana.

But nevertheless to Chapter III. Dub. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice. 223 And cited note io ex. Portella, quod cum tale privilegium sit personale Episcopi, non poterunt alii Sacerdotes, eo absente, in talibus privatis celebrare.

It is done 2. Whether an Episcopus can sometimes dispense, so that a celebration may be held in the Oratory of a private house? By ordinary right, it is not permitted to priests to celebrate Mass anywhere other than in places consecrated by a bishop, or at least blessed by him; and this opinion he holds more securely according to the canon (of Pope Felicis) that treats fittingly of consecration in the first distinction of the First Part. But the case of necessity is excepted; and this opinion he holds to be more secure. But rather is it expressed in that same text. Cases of necessity are I.

If the Church is laid waste, as it is said in the canon. We concede the third distinction first in the part on Consecration. II. If anyone a priest should undertake a long journey through desert places or those inhabited by infidels, as is found in that canon. We grant.

III. When the Church is unable to accommodate the people, so much so that many would lack the Mass. IV. If an army is found in camps, or a multitude of sailors on the shore of the sea; thus commonly DD. ap. Card.

Urban V. n. 3 and in Apud de Miss. And in these cases any priest can celebrate outside the Church on a portable altar. However, it is noted in the third part, first question, third article: likewise, Castrop notes in the twenty-second thesis of Sacr. Miss. d. r p. 8 n. i. quod, cum casus necessitatis dubius foret, Episcopus benè dispensare valeret, juxta dicta l. i n. 192. utque dicemus l. dicemus l. 6 n. 902. v. However, probability.

Furthermore, it is objected that when the Bishop dispenses in some particular case for a just cause, permitting the celebration outside the Church; for it appears congruent from canon law that Bishops, although today they lack the faculty of permitting at their own discretion what once they had, namely, sacred rites to be performed in private houses. Of masses, distin-ction 1, here: In places, in which the Bishop himself has

commanded. And it was more clearly expressed in cap. In his, 3o de Privil., where Honorius III decreed that the Friars Minor and Preachers could celebrate Mass in a portable altar without the permission of the Bishop of the place on account of the same Apostolic Privilege; and he gave the reason, namely, because otherwise the Privilege would have been useless to them, since they already could celebrate outside the Church without it, with the consent of the Ordinary. When however (the words are of the Pontiff) the mentioned indulgence would confer nothing without which that permission of the Prelate would be licit. Whereupon nearly he observed P. 3 in 3 p. d. 8 i sect. 3 v.

Secondly, since Sylvester, Soto, and Navarro, bishops did not lack ancient permission to permit the frequent celebration without any necessity, because that (says Suarez) was not a dispensation but an exercise of their own proper power. Then however, this faculty was withdrawn from Bishops by the Tridentine session 22 in the Decree concerning celebration. Nevertheless, commonly the Doctors understand this to mean a perpetual license to celebrate in the manner of a habit, according to the faculty which bishops previously possessed; but it is by no means forbidden to them that they grant such a license for some time through an act, if there be a just cause. Ita P. Suarez loc. cit. v. Secondly, at the end, where after the case of necessity has been excepted, he says: Also this faculty is by way of dispensation; but the Council did not deprive the Bishop of the power to reasonably dispense in such matters, especially since it is really morally necessary.

And he adds: Finally, this usage confirms it, because thus it is done without any scruple. The same is said by Bonacina in the Fourth Decretal on the Eucharist, in the last question, article 11, where he states: The Bishop can dispense in some case, provided a just cause concurs, so that Mass may be celebrated outside the Church in an honorable place. And he cites Reginaldus, Beja, and from the Decretum, lib. 1, q. 2, part. 1, n. 17, where writing on the topic defended by some DDs and reported to us in book 1, n. 191 (which Bonacina does not disapprove of, nor do we, namely that the Bishop can dispense in all Communion laws, as stated in Cap. III). Dub. IV.

Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, he says that there is not an express reservation by the Apostolic See regarding this dispensation: "I hold that this opinion has at least room in those cases which often occur and require a dispensation; or if some grave necessity or great utility arises, and access to the Holy Seat is not easily available." They hold the same. cel. Whoever advances the same reasoning, does not fail to acknowledge that, since such cases are frequent, this power of dispensing

is morally necessary for Bishops according to what was said in 1. n. 192. The same is taught by Barbosa de Potest Episcop., who says: The Council deliberates on the common manner of celebrating, but it did not, however, deprive Bishops of the power to reasonably dispense in case of necessity or just cause. He also writes Escobar, tom. 3, saying: Such a dispensation with a reasonable cause should not be reckoned among abuses; hence, the Bishop can grant this faculty (of celebrating outside the sacred place) when a noble person is unable to go to church on account of age or infirmity, so that he may hear Mass and receive the Eucharist.

The same is held by Laymann, lib. 5: It does not seem that this power has been taken away from Bishops in a case of necessity for dispensation, so that once or frequently, as reasonable cause shall persuade, it may be permitted to celebrate Mass on an altar consecrated, in a place honest but profane, for the use of secular purposes. He says further: Except for the case wherein the Bishop dispenses on reasonable grounds so that in private chambers, for instance, at the altar of a portable kind, Mass may be celebrated for some sick person. The same thing is said by the Salamanticensians concerning the Sacrament. Mist. tr. 5 c. 4 n. 56. Eibel Theol. mor. eod. tit. pag. 136 n. 233., et La Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 263. cum Coninch.

Rödrig., et quae vocatur necessitas, loquendo de dispensatione, non intelligatur necessitas celebrandi, quia haec dispensatione non indiget, ut superius in priori exceptione observatum est; sed intelligatur necessitas, . §26 Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist: since he is dispensed to celebrate or sent to the Church in order to hear Mass, an imposition is made and a just reason arises for dispensing.

Neither does the traditioned doctrine obstruct the Decretum Clementis. XI. Quod opponit P. Mazzotta, sicut nec praesumptum obstant Decreta Pauli V. et Urbani VIII., quibus vetatur Episcopis ne hujusmodi dispensationem concedant, quia Decreta intelliguntur juxta Tridentini sanctionem, ut ajunt Escobar cum Philiberto, Hurt. scilicet de dispensatione per modum habitis, sed non per modum actus ad tempus pro aliquo casu particulari, quando rationabilis causa dispensandi habetur. And quoniam since after the Tridentine Decree there have not lacked authors such as Sotus and Emanuel Sa who said that it is not a grave sin to celebrate outside the Church if it be celebrated in an honorable place, nay Sotus wrote (as Suarez relates in 3 p. to. 3 dec. 8r sect. 3in princ.) that he never recognized any guilt in secretly celebrating always and secretly so as to avoid scandal; therefore perhaps the aforementioned Pontiffs urge the Bishops to prohibit this on more weighty and clearer decrees. It is doubted thereafter whether such a dispensation can be conceded in this manner? Salamanca, they say either

this, or even that; but all, as it is.

Escobar, indeterminately speak and understand, that it is conceded to be possible during infirmity or for some accidental cause. And they speak of indefinite merit; for it must be strictly interpreted that a dispensation is to be dispensed only when there is a prohibition, and this is to be understood (as we have seen above) only of permanent continuos dispensations, not indeed of those which are conceded for a time with respect to some particular cause and transient. To this Declaration refers Gallus Martin Trid., sessio 2 2. Decretum de Observationibus etc., n. 6: Dicitur: Permitemini Pontifex ordinarius arbitrio necessitate personali et infirmitatis qualitate pensata, ut pro commoditate infirmorum et idem privato oratorio vel alio loco dedicato concedat die ad hoc celebrandam. The same admits Card.

Peter Chapter III. Doubt. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 227 §: 4 in Constitutions, 2 Urban. II. n. 3 dicens: bene licet Episcopo potestatem facere ut in aliquis insignis viri morbo laborantis domo Missae Sacrificium peragatur, ut et særo ille intersit et sacrà reficiatur comunione.

There is added a presumptuous statement, which Honorius III, in the aforementioned chapter, while speaking about permissions to celebrate, did not hesitate to say on this matter: rather a benign interpretation should be made. And if this license can be granted by bishops for secular infirmities, lest they be deprived of the addition of the Mass as stated above, all the more readily can it be granted to priests, who often have some necessity of celebrating, as is gathered from 14 where it is said: Let the bishop see that at least on the days of the Lord's day and solemn feasts the priests celebrate Masses. Quapropter nequirem à culpa levi excusare Sacerdotem illum; qui quotidie celebrare posset (unà hebdomadis die exceptâ ob reverentiam) et sineulla justa causa, sed tantum ob desidiam à celebrando abstinueret; Sacerdôtînón solìm pro se celebrat, dèm praesumptum pro bono totius Ecclesiæ, populique christiani, cujus minister et intercessor est constitutus, juxtà illud. Apostoli: Omnis Pontifex ex hominibus assumptus, pro hominibus constituitur in his quae sunt ad Deum, ut offerat dona et sacrificia pro peccatis. Quamobrem non solum pro se ipse, sed etiam pro aliis qui in eum posuerint fidem, offerens sibi ipsum per gratiam eliciendae pietatis, ut sit semper accipiens et nunquam offerens, sicut et Archetypus a Deo.

Hence arises (as Prüt said) a certain necessity, which: The priest has to celebrate; and therefore bishops can more easily grant priests permission to celebrate in their own houses during their own infirmity. To be noted first, that the privilege of the Oratory indult granted by the Pope endures

until death for those who were thus privileged; nor does it perish with the death of the Pope or bishop who designated this, because grace once given does not expire with the death of the grantor. See Cross l. 6 p. 2 n. 267. Notandum II. quod si privilegiatus mutet dominium livui in aliam diocesim, non invalidat Privilegium Oratorii, quod cum sit personalis, personam sequitur, quamvis requiratur nova approbatio Episcopi et nova iussus Lib. VI. Vide Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 267. Notandum II. quod si privilegiatus mutet domicilium in aliam diecesim non invalidat Privilegium Oratorii, quod cum sit personale personam sequitur quamvis requiratur nova approbatio Episcopi et nova iussus Lib. Treatise. III.

On the Eucharist. Inspection of the place, Croix n. 26o. with c. with sed affirmat Pasqual. apud ipsum, cui non dissentio, si privilegiatus non sit ibi per modum transitus, et locus sit ab Ordinario jam approbatus., Notandum III. hoc quod habetur in Decreto emanato a Clemente XI die 15 decembr. 1703 quod in extensum affert Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 258 ubi sic dicitur: Nonnulli Episcopi et complures Regulares sub praetextu privilegiorum ea sibilare putant, quae prohibita sunt... Regulares...in quibusdam...nobillium personarum privatis Oratorii s, quae certis quandoque ex clavis d Sede Apostolica concedi solent, celebrare audent, vel plures Missas quàm in iis sit indulum, vel absque presentia personarum quarum contemplatione concessio emanavit, vel extra debitas horas et post meridiem, vel illis praesumptum diebus quibus per Constitutiones Diacresanas aut praesumptum Decreta S. C. Concilii celebrari prohibetur aut quae in ipsis Indulis Apostolicis excipiuntur. Then it is declared: Private oratories, which have been granted by the Holy See, are not permitted to be celebrated by Regulars of any Order... or other such priests, even if they were bishops, on those days. Paschatis, Pentecostes, Nativitatis Christi Domini, altisque anni festis solemnioribus, ac diebus in Indulto exceptis. In other days however mentioned, it is not permitted to Regulars and to whatever Priests, even presumptively Bishops, to celebrate in said Oratories; where a unique Mass, which is conceded in the Indult, has been celebrated: upon this he who celebrates is bound diligently to inquire, and himself to be well informed thereof. And that it may not be celebrated presumptuously after midday in any of those cases permitted; further demanding...in all such cases, no persons whatsoever who hear those Missas are at all to satisfy the precept of the Church. Whereby, it is concluded that they are prohibited from celebrating in private Oratories according to Chapter III.

Doubt. IV. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 229 not only on days of Pasch, Pentecost, and the Nativity of Christ the Lord, as expressed in the Decretals, but also on the presumed Friday of the Epiphany during the Lord's Supper, on days of Annunciation, Ascension, and Assumption B.

Mary, as on a feast day. Peter and Paul, and all the Saints, according to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rituals issued on 17 November 1607 (found among Merati in the Index t: 1 p. 2 n. 74), of which Clement XI spoke in the aforementioned Decree.

However, it is to be noted according to Croix n. 271, 1., that where such an oratory has been conceded on account of infirmity, it can be celebrated every day except those presumed; and thus decreed the Sacred Congregation as reported by P. Zacharia according to Croix 1:6 p. 2 n. 271, adding moreover that only one Mass may be celebrated there on the feast of the Nativity of the Lord. It must be noted 2. that this proceeds only in private oratories, and not in public ones with the permission of the Bishop blessed, as we have said above, in which solemn Mass can be celebrated on any day excepted, as is evident from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of 3 September 1671, according to Merati in the index n. 302. It is concluded: 2. that if in the Indult it be said that one Mass is celebrated daily, neither may any priests, under whatever pretexts of privileges, celebrate another Mass other than that one, for bishops and regulars, as rightly they say, Benedictus XIV. Note.: 29 n. 8, et Quarti apud Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 268, et Tournelius Misc. casu 3, qui censet, non vetari ne plures Missae celebrentur, etsi dicatur in Indulto unica Missa quotidie celebratur vel una tantum: quia ut ait, to una non est particula taxativa, prout si in fundatione dicitur, volumus ut quotidie una Missa celebretur in tali altari, non ideo plures prohibentur Missae. This opinion, however, seems altogether improbable; for privileges or concessions against some prohibited law strictly must be received as such, whence the particle "una" imports the same as "unica," and what is conceded for one time cannot be extended to many times; so that if someone were to concede to someone the right to pass through his field once, he would not thereby be permitted to pass many times. This is evident from the cited Decree, where it is condemned the Regulars who dare to celebrate more than one Mass in the priories of the Oratorians when such permission is given only for one Mass.

Cum autem in indulto sit una missa ex praesa, qui plures missas celebrarent, jam auderent celebrare ultra concessionem in indulto expressam. Nor is the equality of the foundation's establishment valid; for there it does not prohibit that more Masses be celebrated elsewhere, nor could the founder have prohibited it; but in the private chapels of the Oratorians another Mass cannot be celebrated except that which is expressly mentioned in the Indult, since generally it is prohibited elsewhere so that no Mass be celebrated there; hence, when it is said that one Mass is granted by the Indult, it means the same as when it is called unique, for in both expressions the mind of the Pontiff intends that a

second Mass not be celebrated. You will say: The celebration of several Masses is not prohibited with respect to those who celebrate them, but with respect to those who hear them, who in other Masses, after the first allowed ones have been celebrated, would not satisfy the precept. Ad quod respondeo, quod prohibito sit non solum respectu audientium, sed etiam respectu celebrantium praesumptivorum: primum quia omnibus ventum est, ne celebrent in cultu divino Oratoris, qui per consecrationem vel benedictionem Episcopi non sunt destinati; secundum quia in Decreto praefato Clementis duo sequentia per se prohibentur, et Sacerdotibus ne alias Missas praeter unam confessam celebranti, et audientibus ne in iis praecepto satisfaciant. First it is derived from those words: to regulars and priests whatever, and presumptuously to bishops, in the aforementioned oratories it is not permitted to celebrate, where a presumptuous Mass, which is conceded by the Indulgence, has already been celebrated.

Altera: Denominando ulterius, in omnibus hujusmodi casibus personas quorumcumque dictas Missas audientes nullatenus praecepto Ecclesiae satisfacere. After these things written, bull N. SS. was sent to the youth. P. Benedicti XIV. Great, on June 2, 1757, when this matter was concluded, for the Pontiff declared there, how such Indults are to be understood: These were established as law, as can be gathered from the form of the Letters in the form of a Brief which is granted:... And only one Mass is celebrated in the Oratory on any given day. Therefore, prohibited not than Cap. III.

Dub. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 33 Inasmuch does it regard those who listen, but more so those who preside in celebration, when in private Oratories there are found to be older rights for celebrating more Masses. You may ask whether it is permissible to administer the Eucharist in private Oratories without the license of the Bishop? It is certain that the Bishop can prohibit the celebration of Communions in a private Oratory, as declared by Ben.

XIV. In Bulla Magna, edita die 2 Junii 1751. If otherwise there is no prohibition, asserts the Cleric of the Fourth [section]. R. 14 dicentem quod suscipio Eucharistiae in oratorio privato nullam injuriam inferat parocho quando non est de præcepto. They however deny it, namely Diana, and the Fourth [Doctor], and Giribaldus according to Benedict. XIV. Formerly in Rome, permission was denied to a certain noble matron to communicate in a private Oratory, except in cases of necessity.

They deny the presumptuous Pignatell. Pasquier de Sacramentis et Petrus Gattica c. 29 n. 6, quia ministration Eucharistiae pertinet ad jurisdictionem Ordinarii, cum sit actus pascendi oves; et ideò Regularibus, ut

Eucharistiam ministrarent, specialibus indiguerunt privilegiis. Hereby the same Pope Benedict. XIV. In Encyclical to Bishops of the Kingdom of Poland, issued on the same day, June 2, 1761, he prohibited receiving Communion in private Oratories by those who are absent without permission of the Bishop. As regards the Sacrament of Penance, it is certain that it is not licit to minister it without just cause in a private Oratory, as is contained in the Roman Ritual concerning the Sacrifice.

Penitence: In the Church, but not in private houses (the priest) shall hear confessions, unless for a reasonable cause; yet when such a case occurs, he should nevertheless strive to provide that in a decent and open place. That was confirmed in the aforementioned Bull Magna §. 20. But how do private Oratories satisfy by hearing Mass there? See what is said in the aforementioned 1. 2 n. 350. 3 "Tertio." By the privilege which they say we have, Mi-360 and those who participate with us; this was revoked on December 22 from the list of observances and exemptions in Cel. Mis-232 Lib.

VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist. Though many wish it, they nevertheless deny it, p. 4, t. 4.

Reply 106. That is said with Card. de Lugo d. 20 s. 2n. 5 i probabiliter, et celebr. 1. 1 c. 3 §. 3 probabilibus, V. Gregory XIII. ut possint tum in Missionibus cum facultate Superioris in quovis loco decenti, tum in domibus suis in loco honesto, à Provinciali designato Missas dicere; in quo idem licebit aliis. This judgment, namely, that the privilege of Regulars concerning private Oratories has not been revoked around the date of 15 December 1763 (as is well taught at Croix in book 6, page 2, note 258; for in said Decrees it is thus declared: Privileges conceded to certain Regulars and communicated by some Supreme Pontiffs to other Regulars regarding the use of a portable altar, and celebrating therein without the license of ordinaries in places where they are permitted, have been entirely revoked by the same Council of Trent. And the same [thing] declared Benedict.

XIV. in citato. Bulla Magnus § 29. P. Mazzotta however says in tom. 3 p. 186, this is to be understood only of private houses, not of their own houses by the Religious. But here the Constitution of Innocent must be adverted to. XIII. edited 13.

Maji 1723. quae ini- pit, Apostolici Ministerii (apud Merati t. 1. p. 2. in Indice n. G48.) ubi sic habetur; Circ d missarum celebrationem in privatis oratoriis, juxtad Clem. XI. Decreased (as aforementioned) the bishops should take care that all things established there be observed everywhere:

and furthermore he added a prohibition, lest anything be erected in private cells or cubicles of regulars for the purpose of sacred works... removed whatever is contrary to custom. I have said that it is not violated; because in the Church internally violated, unless first reconciled, it will not be permissible under a grave sin, as 2. non violata; quia in Ecclesia interius violata, nisi prius reconcilietur, non licebit sub gravi peccato, ut . » Concilium et cetera, nisi in necessitate, cum venia Episcopi, Caput III.

Dub. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 255 » (if this can be adored, otherwise without it, as the Cardinal has it. » According to Lugo l.c. n. 63., it is celebrated; or bury the dead. * (Indeed also with Lugo and with .) * It is asked whether the celebrant incurs some penalty in a polluted Church during consecration, Sylv. v. consecratio, 2 qu. 9. . 10 c. 26 qu. 16, et Graff. lib. 21 n.366., say that he incurs suspension from the entrance of the Church, according to c. Episcoporum de Privil. n6, where it is stated that celebrants in interdicted places (as it is said there) recognize the interdict upon their entrance into the Church. But they deny it more probingly, Suar d. 8r sect. 4.

Lugo, d. 20, n. 52. Bened. XIV. on the Sacrifice. Omission. 1. 3. loc. cit. n. 368. Reason, because the text does not speak of celebrants polluted in the temple, but rather of a temple being interdicted by a general interdict; yet it differs whether the temple is interdicted or whether it is polluted.

So much less does it incur irregularity, as Escob. XIV. ll. cc. against Hostiensis rightly assert, because violation of the Church is not a censure by which irregularity is incurred. « I add 1. The Church: because it is appointed for oratory, although destined for divine worship, yet if it has not been blessed, there must be an altar within it for performing divine services, as Bonaventure says. » concerning the mater. q. 4 res. ult. n. q., they are not capable of violations. That likewise consequently concerning hospitals teaches n. 60 of Lugo. I add 2.

Within: because that which is done in a tower, sacred-tia, above the roof, or oven, in the crypt, under the pavement (unless it be burial, or singularly blessed), does not violate the Church..*(With 67, at the end with Nisi reconcileitur: what should be done by the Bishop or Priest, according to privilege of the Pope, which Superiors of regulars have for their own chapels, as noted by Diana in Avila p. 4 t. 4 R. 91. if it was consecrated (Then use blessed water from the Bishop, or themselves, if the Bishop is distant two days, as stated in 6 with others) *, what is presumptuous if a feast of dedication is celebrated. If however it has merely been blessed, it can be reconciled by aspersion with blessed water by a simple priest (Nevertheless, an episcopal delegation should precede, as noted by Palaus

p. 8 n. 14, and is found in Riuuli; but the water itself can be blessed by the very priest, as Heur says). But Bcn. XIV. From the Synod 1:3 c.15 n.2 in fin., it is said: If (the Church) has been simply blessed; then it establishes that no previous delegation can be made by means of a simple priest to offer blessed water, which they call either holy or lustration water, for the purification of a polluted Church. * Whether with the faculty of the Bishop or without cause, according to 91.

It teaches presumptuously that a reconciliation has been effected if a sacrifice has been performed therein, e. § 4, ex Henr. Sa, et Diana esse probabile: negat autem Card. de Lugo de Euch d. 20s. 2 n. 62. *(Et cum de Lugo idem meritò sentiunt . 27n: 256. Against four, and because there is no celebration that takes the place of reconciliation. See directive n. 380.) * However, the Church and the congregation are violated or polluted by the following cases: nevertheless, not unless after the matter has been made public. . 5 t. 6 c. 5. Unless publicly established as fact, the Church is not deemed polluted; regarding the presumptuous respect for itself by the delinquent: he assumes, however, that such presumption is declared through a declaratory judgment of the judge: but this opinion does not belong to Chapter III.

Dub. IV. On the Eucharist, it is a Sacrifice. I consider it safe, since it is contrary to common opinion, which they themselves hold in Canon 5, Number 5: 8. de Sacr. Matz: de Sacr., tit. t. 6 n. 44 r. Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 289: tit. c. 5 q. 4, qui omnes dicunt, sufficeré ad pollutionem notorietatem sive juris, sive facti; et hoc patet clare ex c. Significanti de Adul., ubi ob notorietatem tantum facti fuit declaratum, Eccle-siam esse reconciliandam. And from the same text is manifestly and equally deduced, as they say in presumptuous [or "presumptive"] 4. c: 3 nu. 87 and Escob: de Missa « 1.

By the fact of homicide in it, mortal or injurious; at least to the immutability of the Church, which is presumed, that what would otherwise be just by the judgment of the Judge; unless indeed it happens as a case, or by mistake. II. that for its defense. III. Cujus causa data est extra Ecclesiam: quia requiritur ut vulnus sive causa physica fiat intra Ecclesiam. V. quod in sui defendi non potest extra Ecclesiam: quia requiritur ut vulnus sive causa physica fiat intra Ecclesiam. Cardinal de Lugo, s. 2, n. 53.

It is asked whether the Church is violated if a lethal wound is inflicted within the Church without the shedding of blood, and death ensues outside thereof? Suarez denies it. d. 81 s. 4.: 10 c. 26 qu: 3 et Diana p. 6 tr. 6 R. 36 cum Præp. et Eccl. they require that death within the Church be understood thus, saying that death must follow inside the Church. But

more probably Lugo affirms this, d. 20 n. 53. with the common, 68 and Escob.: l. 21 n. 37: since the text does not express it, death within the Church is required when it says there only: Homicides are permitted to occur; and sometimes wounds may be inflicted; and then reconciliation is required: therefore from the text nowhere is death within the Church required: for because suffices to violate the Church that a physical cause of death within the Church has been given (we say physical, for well Escob. and Lugo 11. cit. add in n. 377 cum Præp. et Eccl., non sufficeré causam moralem, namely mandate or counsel of homicide given). Sylv. ... 47 et Persicum apud quia. The Church is defiled more by action than by the shedding of blood, which results from injury; yet in the text itself, o.

If the Church from the consession. The Church which is about to be adduced below, where it says that the Church is violated through the shedding of blood, does not require the shedding of blood within the Church; hence there is always and ever present a harmful assault with the shedding of blood, by which the Church is violated. The same must be said if someone existing outside the Church shoots an arrow or another dart, and kills; but it must be said otherwise, as well says Lugo, n. 53: if a wound is inflicted outside, and death occurs within the Church, or blood is shed there: because then there is no injury to the Church. By means of a mortal and evil effusion of one's own blood, or of another's blood or seed, caused or suffered, whether in the temple. Wherefore he does not violate the first commandment.

If even a drop flows out; because it is not an effusion. * (As they commonly presume, Praesumptum Bened. ut dicit.*) XIV. from the third question concerning Power and other matters; this is evident from chapter 7: If the Church consecrates 10. If a few "drop effluant; because there is no effusion." * (As they say » presumed commonly Bened. XIV. de 3 c. » 7. . de Potest. et . et aliis; » this is evident from the c. Si Ecclesia 10 de Consec.

Eccl. » where it is said: If an unholy Church, whose seed or blood has been polluted by effusion, may be forthwith cleansed by water that has been promptly exorcised. Note 10 sanguinis effusione, quae copiam significat.) * II. If from a light blow or wound, for instance, from a nosebleed in a brawl among the populace, even though abundant blood may flow, it is thus presumptuously supposed; because commonly there is not a mortal sin in this. Otherwise S, v.

The Church no. 13. Diana p. 3 tr. 6 R. 24 et Marchin. ac l. 21 n. 372. id extendunt praesumptum ad adultos, quia sanguis è nat- Cap. III. Dub. IV. In the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 35j "It is not properly said to effuse from the wound, since blood commonly exudes from the nose."

But it is sufficiently established by Bon. in the sixth part at the end number twenty and et et: Franc. Lugo suppose that the Church is violated if such an effusion occurs with a mortal sin, because then there is already an injurious effusion gravely in the Church.)* III. If a section is made from the vein. IV. Actus compagalis, quando excursatur a sacrilegio. (Vide dicta de hoc d. 3 n. 458. V.)

Fornicatio facta ab amente. VI. Accused pollution; see de Lugo, d. 20, n. 54 and 55. » » 3. Through burial, excommunicated persons are not tolerated, 368 » or infidel (by this name one is not comprehended) haeresis teaches Card. de Lugo l.c. n. 57; presumptuous » infant; as from c. Ecclesiam de V. 4 q. 4 p. ult.

» 4. By destruction of the Church either totally or in part (Parietum vel fruste). » Although in that case it is more properly said to be exposed to being destroyed rather than polluted; yet, if only the roof is destroyed or if it is gradually demolished and renovated bit by bit, then » even though the entire Church may be renewed, Palaces ibid. » With regard to what is presumed to pollute the material of the Church, it should be considered as polluted; but not contrarywise). Neither by presumption through desolation, heretical exercise, or the pollution of human beings or animals thus stationed, even if it seems fitting and has practice, that through a Bishop or perhaps a Priest with some ceremony he is reconciled and washed: in such a similar case understand this to be about the altar. . 5 t. 5 c. 5. You inquire.

What is it, and when ought execration or anathema to be pronounced? » Resp. It is called an exercatio; when a sacred thing loses its consecration, so that it must be newly consecrated, which happens when it is destroyed to such an extent that it loses both its form and its use. Wherefore it resolves. R. When the Church is polluted, it is presumed that the fixed altars thereof are polluted: yet when the Church is execrated, the altars thereof are not execrated; nor is the contrary true.

» 2. The Church will be desecrated if the walls are removed for the greater part, or all of them broken down, at least a considerable portion should remain ruined. But in the case of many, if one follows another. V. Lugo dated 20th day, number 56.

And this is presumed through intervals of weeks or days, so that the Church as a whole may be renewed, lest . si sessa. 4 casu 6, p. 8 n. 15 cum Sylv. » Sa, et consecratq, cum majus dignum trahat ad se, minus dignum;

idque procedit, etiamsi adst animus totam Ecclesiam destruendi, utpote. . c. cum Navatr. » ... etc., quia illa intentio non impedivit, sed ut consecratio permaneret; * Non tamen si tectum corruat, quia consecratio est in parietibus. V. Laicus.

loc. cit. 369. » 3. Altare executur i. If, having been fixed, the paving stones are removed from the lower structure, the altar is executed otherwise. Thus from this: Understand this of the table totally consecrated, so that in any part thereof a sacrifice may be offered.

Nevertheless, the altar will not be executed if some of the stones that constitute its structure are merely removed, as Suar teaches in d. 8i sect. 5. . 6 n. 6. But let it be transferred elsewhere together with the stones that adhere to it; for the text does not speak of separation from the structure. This is concerning a fixed altar; but a portable altar is minimally executed if the altar is moved from the timbers, sive from the capsule in which the altar is enclosed; for that capsule has been instituted not according to form, but solely for custody and ornamentation, as correctly stated in n. 3 and . en Ang. The text, however, which prohibits separation speaks only of the fixed altar. Chapter III.

Doubt. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 259. Note however the Decree of the Holy See found at Morati t. 1 p. 2. in Index n. 303 where it was thus stated. Possessing an indult from the Apostolic See to erect a private oratory in one's own home, if anyone should wish to build a wooden altar there, he does not need the faculty of the Apostolate provided that the wooden altar is not detached and immovably joined with sacred stone walls, nor should the image of a portable altar be placed there.

See no. 24. 13. If it is thus broken (whether fixed or portable), so that in no integral part thereof a chalice and paten can possibly be placed together 2 (According to this, if in any part there is both a chalice and a paten: such that the host can possibly be contained therein, as Lugo, from c. 3. de Conc.) When the Church commands that the altar table be stripped bare, it is to be understood that if a chalice has been broken (whether fixed or portable), so that in no integral part can the chalice and paten coexist (According to Lugo, from c. 3 of the Decretum). Moreover, whether an altar can be made from two unjoined stones? [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions]

[TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] That which is found in the Nicene Council, they say should be understood as referring to relics required in the Church, but not on every altar; at least such a precept, if ever there was one, they consider to have been abrogated by the contrary custom. To the prayer of that Mass, "Of Whose Relics," etc., they respond, understanding it under the condition if they are present. Tamen his non obstantibus, putor non recedendum a prima sententia, tum propter universalem contrariam consuetudinem, quam non immerito Tourn. censet firmatam ex eo quod (ut advertit cum Sylvio) in antiquo Missali praecipiatur omitti praedicta oratio in Missa si desint Reliquiae; ac posteriora Missalia hanc exceptionem abstulerunt; tum propter Decreta S. C. Rituum, mox infra adducenda, quibus detelaratur execratum altare a quo removentur Reliquiae vel frangitur sigillum; unde satis probatur Reliquias esse necessarias ad altaris consecrationem. And on January 19, 1614, this was declared by another Decree.

Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 2055. Decr. 143. where it was stated, a portable wooden altar is to be permitted provided it has a reliquary repository. It is doubted 2. whether an altar loses its consecration if the seal is broken or if the tomb with the relics is removed? By the name Sepulcrum is understood that receptacle in which the Reliquiae are deposited: by the name Sigillum is understood that little stone with which the sepulcrum is closed. The first opinion denies it; and this is held by [author] in section 21, chapter i, number 134, article 259, with Anacl. and Escob., book 21, note 426, with the authority of the Fathers.

Cross number 306. at the end, who considers it probable with 9. They employ the same reasoning as above, namely, because it is not certain that the precept requires the Reliquiae to be necessary, Chapter III. Dub. IV. Of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice. 24v for the consecration of the altar.

Nevertheless, the more common opinion affirms this, and those who hold it include Pons, Habert, t. 5 p. 704 q. 3. c., as well as Sylvius. Angelus, Durandus. p. 9 n. 6. Reason, because (as it is said, . And I deem this judgment to be held from the Decretals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, for on March 5, 1603, it declared thus: The portable consecration is lost then; when broken or moved, the reliquary (apud Item on March 5, 1623, it declared; It cannot be celebrated on an altar, to which a relic, secretly and not removed or broken, has been attached by soldiers, unless the altar is newly consecrated, (apud eumd. On the day twenty-first of June 1610 thus he responded: If an altar has been consecrated in the manner of a portable altar, it is not execrable in any removal, but only

when its sepulcrum Religiarum is broken (ap.

However they say Tour. et . Here incidentally another decree of the Sacred Congregation published on November 10, 1599 (as stated previously: If dead bodies are buried under an altar or beneath its steps, Mass is not to be celebrated there until they are transferred elsewhere. The same was confirmed on June 13, 1635. ap. However, Croix notes in his work, volume 6, page 2, note 2067, that if corpses are buried deeply in some cell beneath a constructed vaulted nave, it does not seem to prohibit Mass being said thereupon; for then the corpses appear sufficiently separated from the altar, and at such times the words spoken do not fall upon them, of which kind here these religious are concerned. « 4. The chalice is execrated if it be notably broken, even though it be as small a breach as three inches; *unless indeed there be a hole at the bottom, albeit minutest, so that the chalice may retain the sacred species, according to Ron, c. 5 q. 4, when Diana.*

» if the figure be destroyed: yet not if it be in a cruet on the paten. » It is separated from the chalice, because in the paten alone is consecrated, Bon. d. 4 c. ult. p. 9. ex Neque execratur, si pereat inauratio. Wherefore, although commonly the chalice and paten are consecrated after a new inauration, so that they may contain the part of Christ's body or blood, it is taught by Bon., and others, even if defective, that water blessed for this purpose is sufficient: thus: t. 1. Miscellanea responsionum tertia, et decima duodecimae dissertationis novemquingentesimaquarta. "Dubitatur i."

Is the chalice execrated, if the setting perish? They affirm Az. I. 21 n. 468. quia tollitur subjectum immediatum consecrationis, cum tota unctio in superficie calicis fiat. They, however, more reasonably deny the common opinion expressed by Lugo on the 20th day of the month, number 94. Sporer n. 399. cum .

Fill., et patet, quia si calix non sit tornatilis, et pes ejus frangatur, etiamsi cuppa integra maneat, calix erit executus, ut omnes communiter dicunt; ergo non in sola superficie consistit consecratio, sed in toto calice. Doubt. 2. The chalice, which is newly re-silvered, needs new consecration? Affirming. Section 81, Article 3, item Vasq. Sylv., Ang., c. 4 n. 90. quia calix consecratur propter contactum sanguinis Christi, unde, quando illius superficies non est consecrata, necessario requiritur ut calix de novo consecretur.

They, however, deny more plausibly in Lugo, d. 20, n. 95: n. 6. Escob. 1. 21 n. 473. with Duran: 10, and Dian? likewise the Council. Sa, et: 1. c. Et

probabile putat atque valdè adhaeret Ratio, quia cum sit communis doctrina ut mox supra vidimus quod calix Cap. III. Dub. IV.

Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice: 345 by losing its inauguration, it does not lose its consecration; similarly, its consecration is not lost if it is reinaugurated anew, just as if the consecrated Church were to be newly defiled, it would not need new consecration; thus commonly the Doctors feel; or if a small part of any bodily tear is assumed, this remains presumptuous: blessed, so that it may be clearly inferred from the single chapter on Consecration. The Church in Book 6 where it is said to draw more worthy to itself what is less worthy. They object: although the chalice remains consecrated, yet that golden surface is not itself consecrated, which alone immediately touches the blood of Christ; similarly, if a finer cup were placed within the chalice, this would not become sacred; likewise, if unanointed oil were mixed with a smaller part of anointed oil, it is from the very mixture that the consecration takes place, as is evident from c. Quod in dubiis 3. de Conser. Ecclus. ubi dicitur: Non negamus quin oleum non consecratum consecrato commiserit possit: alia autem est ratio cuppae in aliam immissee, quae utique est vas distinctum, ac superficiei aureae, quae fit pars ejusdem calicis, et facit unum cum illo. Nevertheless, all these aforementioned objections not withstanding, considering it better to deliberate thoroughly, I judged that for a new reparation of the chalice, it should be consecrated anew as a reason, because then the surface of the chalice, which has immediate contact with the Blood of Christ, remains unconsecrated; much more so, as Barbosa and many others testify, such is the practice of the Church and the received custom of re-consecrating chalices, all being renewed anew.

In casu autem, quo per longum usum inauratio defecerit, puto probabile dicendum cum Sylvio et Ferraris non requiri novam consecrationem ad celebraendum cum hujusmodi Calice; quia tunc viget ratio, quod calix semel conseratus totus deinde per modum unius consecratus remaneat. When however new inauration intervenes, the added gold which is not consecrated touches immediately the Blood. Dubitatur 3. Is it licit to celebrate using a chalice that has never been made of gold? He affirms, n. 3, that (as he says) such use has prevailed; but this reason does not seem to hold today, since usage is now everywhere contrary to it.

But Croix considers this probable in his book 6, page 2, number 346, along with others frequently as he asserts, perhaps guided by another reason, namely because, although it is stated in the rubric under title 1 on Preparation: The cup should be either of gold or silver, or at least have an inner lining of silver and gold, and simultaneously with the paten there should be a tidera lined with gold. However in another rubric under title

10 n. 1 it is thus stated: The chalice cup should be golden, or silvery, or brass: neither earthen nor glassy; no mention being made of consecration, no mention being made of consecration; whence it follows that the deficiency thereof is not to be reckoned among defects. And in the first heading it could be required to demand the inauguration solely for congruity and greater decency, since there the golden cup is expressly demanded, or at least silver, yet nevertheless a tin one is admitted in the second heading. Others, however, as Tourn. to. 5 p. 815 and Lugo d. 20 n. 90 state, do not absolve from venial fault in consecrating in an uncrowned cup, unless poverty excuses; and this seems more probable, since it is said in the first Rubric that the cup should at least have a crowned argentine crown, etc.; and this is confirmed by common custom. Neither does it hinder the second Rubric, where a leaden chalice is permitted; for this must be understood according to the text in chapter Ut calix 44., where it is said that consecration may be performed in a leaden chalice only on account of poverty; nor should it be thought that the Rubric intended to derogate from the text; whence, lest it be said that the Rubric contradicts itself, it must be understood that the first Rubric should be interpreted according to the second, requiring an argentine chalice, unless poverty excuse; and under the same limitation should it be understood when it requires inauguration.

Here, however, it is incidentally to be noted that the rubric permits a tin chalice, Cap. II, Dub. II. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice: 264 ed non aerem; However, the Rubrica does not prohibit the use of a calix made from brass or gilded aurichalcum, for in the cited text "Ut calix," such a salix is forbidden to that extent only which causes an eruption equivalent to that which provokes vomiting: But a brass or gilded aurichalcum calix does not cause rust; and therefore it says so. It is doubted 4. If a chalice should lose its consecration if the paten be separated from the foot?

If the chalice is fixed to the foot, it is certain among all, that consecration is lost? If however the weight is returned, S. and Palud. 1. 21 n. 474 assert presumptuously that because of the separation the calix has already lost its form. But commonly Suarez denies in d. 8r sect. 7. Lugo d. 26 n. 93. et Escob, n. 476, cum Ratio, quin per talem separationem Calix revera formam non perdit, cum ejus partes sine novo artificio jungi possint. « 5. Sacred vestments are rendered unfit for use when they are so damaged that their purpose is lost; thus, if belts can no longer properly encircle the body, or if the sleeve separates from the alb, even though they may later be repaired.

Non 4 perdunt autem, etsi attritis pars aliqua assuatur; 5 vel cinguli parti

apte adhuc ad cingendum altera 6 annectatur, quia tunc accessorium sequitur principale, Lugo, 1. r c. 3 § 24 8 (Ità praesumptum dicunt cum communi, Eibel n. 282. cum 10 . et aliis passim. Wherefore they say: Section 2 and 3, note 26, and cum: When a vessel is rendered unworthy by diminution or fraction, so that it decently contains a chalice with its paten: An alb when it is thus separated from the stole: A cincture, when it is broken in such a way that neither part can be used for cingulation: A stola; when it cannot cover the shoulders: And similarly if any part of it is torn, even though it is immediately laid aside, because it has already lost its form). Likewise, if a stola or a doubled casula, by easy separation, become two pieces, each of which is suitable for the Sacrifice, they do not lose their blessing. Section 2. and Sa, ap.) » » 6. Parts avulse from the thing consecrated, destroyed and its form lost, cease to be sacred; for instance, wood and stones uprooted from the Church or altar: nevertheless, on account of respect for the sacred thing of which they are relics, they cannot be applied to profane use or sale without the license of the Pope. Statuae autem sacrae et imagines templi destructi debent in alio collocari, et in loco Ecclesive Crucis erigi. Torn presumptuously paraments, or those worn out by age, should be consumed by fire: and they ought not to be appropriated for profane uses, as is stated in the canon of the altar, de Vide.

Massa, et loc. cit. c. 6. 1, de exped. Sacred. » c. 2 §3. ex 13 res. 76. docent, quod non sit saltem mortale, si mutata forma ad profanos usus applicetur; v. gr. » A broken chalice, dissolved altar-cloth, fragments of body, etc. See above I 3 tract. 1 c. 2 d. 2. (See what was said above 1. 3 num. 41). To which add this, which is contained in the chapter Ligna de ubi Hyginus Papa thus decreed: Ligna dedicated to the Church should not be joined to any other work except to some church, or they are to be burned with fire, or for the benefit of a Monastery. They nevertheless advert . 21 c. 10 n. 146. when anyone commonly should not use such wood in the kitchen of the religious.

Moreover, Sylvus says. » v. Benedictionem quaestio 7. lapides ecclesiae diruta in » religiosorum edificiis collocandos esse; sed hos nemo dicit eorum; quos observavit, necullo textu video probatum. Which of these, whether it be permitted to secular priests to celebrate in the churches of regulars, contrary to the bishop's prohibition? It seems to obstruct the Decretals on Matters to be Observed in celebration.

Miss, where: Each (bishop) in Chapter III. Dub. V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. They interdict Diocesan priests, so that no wandering and unknown Priest may celebrate Masses there; but one might respond that this is said in their own Dioceses. Moreover, Regulars of the

Church are exempt from the jurisdiction of Bishops, whence they are considered as if located outside the Diocese, as has been probably stated at the end of l. 1 n. 156. However, it is referred to by Lezana in 't. 1 c. 12 n. 41. v.

Regarding the twelfth, the Sacred Congregation of the Council declared on June 2, 1620, that it is not permitted to Regulars in their churches to admit secular priests for celebration against the prohibition of the Bishop. Whether, however, such Declarations oblige as laws? See what is said in book 1, note 106. V. DOUBT. What are required for Mass? 372 They are moved forward, which are prescribed in the Rubric. 373 J.

A consecrated altar is required. 374 II. A triple map. Doubt 1: Whether a single draped map or one that is duplicated suffices? Dub. 2. Whether a Mappa ought to be blessed? Dub. 3.

Should a mappa rather than a corporale be made of linen? 376 Sacred vestments and secular ones. 377 Doubt 1. Is it a mortal sin to celebrate with a Stole, or with a Muffler and Girdle? Dub. 2. May it be lawful to celebrate without any sacred vestment out of fear of death? 378 Dub. 3. May Regular Prelates bless sacred vestments?

Dub. 4. May Bishops delegate to others the permission to bless vestments? (See the presumption, no. 381.) Dub. 5. Whether the color of garments be commanded.) 379 IV. The chalice and paten consecrated. Whether the chalices, vestments, etc., remain consecrated or blessed if anyone celebrates with them? Whether abbots can bless chalices, paraments, etc., presumptuously for alien churches? To whom it is licit to touch sacred vessels, corporalia, and vestments? Concerning the pyxide, and material of the same kind as the chalice. Dub. 1.

Whether a pyx ought to be consecrated? 385 Dub. 2. Whether it should be blessed? 386 Y. Benedicted corporal. Sixth. Treatise.

III. Of Thanksgiving. 387 To whom is it permitted to wash the corporal? And whether the water of the ablutions must altogether be poured into the sanctuary? 388 VI. Ball line. Is it a mortal sin to celebrate without the Pallium, or even if it is not blessed?

And whether it is permissible to use two palls? 389 VII. Purificatorium. Whether this ought to be blessed? Missale. May it be permitted to celebrate in necessity without the Missal, or with the Missal according to diverse rites? 391 IX.

Male minister. Dub. I. What kind of sin is it to celebrate without a Minister? 392 Dub. 2. Whether a grave sin is committed by a priest celebrating with a laywoman as minister or respondent? 393 X.

Crucified. Dub. 1. Is it a mortal sin to celebrate without a Cross or a Crucifix? Dub. 2. Whether, remaining a great image of the Crucified on the altar, another cross is required?

And whether a cross and another image of saints should be blessed? 394 XI. Wax candle. Dub. 1. Is it permissible to celebrate with candles made from tallow or oil? Dub. 2.

Whether it is licit to celebrate with one tallow candle? And is one enlightened by four candles? 395 XII. Antipendium, Pulvillus, Bursa, Velum, et Manutergium. Baldane capitis. 397 Dub. 1. Whether it is a mortal sin to cover one's head during prayer?

What, if there is a reason for celebrating thus? Is it licit to celebrate with a false veil? Is the rubric of the Missal directive or preceptive? Is it mortally sinful to omit lighter ceremonies in an important part? And how much time is to be taken up in the celebration? Monitum. 401 Are all Decreta of the Sacred Congregation of Rites strictly obliging? 402 Is it licit to celebrate with bare feet, or with a staff et cetera? 403 Concerning the omission of parts in the Mass; and whether omissions should be repeated? 404 About omitted Ordinary parts. 405 What omission is mortal, and signally in the Canon? 406 What omission is merely venial? 407 What mutilation is mortal? 408 Concerning the purification of the chalice to be made. 409 About omitted Extraordinary parts; and presumption regarding the washing of hands. 410 Doubt. 1. How shall Regulars sinning name the General's name in the Canon as the Vice Bishop?

And by what name is the Bishop to be nominated? dub. 2. Does he sin by omitting prayers before or after Mass? dub. 3. Do they sin by omitting prayers before or after putting on vestments? dub. 4. An. peccet Sacerdos non recitans in Missa solenni, qua continentur a Cap. III. Dub.

V. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 24g Chorus? Dub. 5. How does he sin who celebrates distractedly out of voluntary distraction? How does the Priest sin by adding something extra in the Mass? Is it permissible to say Mass before Matins and Lauds? Released to n. 347. 415 Concerning those things that should be said either with uplifted voice or lowered voice. 414 Doubtful 1. Would he sin so recusatingly celebrating, that he might not

himself hear himself? 415 Doubt 2.

Does a reciter sin by submissively reading what should be called with reverence? Is it mortal to speak reverently of those things that are to be read submissively? When is it licit to change the Mass? On which days are Masses prohibited? On which days are votive Masses prohibited? And on which days are they permitted? Moreover, when then can P be freely said at any time by discretion? I. Is it a mortal sin to say Mass for one who has received stipend, that he hold himself bound to say Mass for the dead, whether votive or otherwise, at this altar, provided he offers money in petition (though within the limits permitted by the rubrics; neglect of which would invert the order of the Church for another's devotion, not fittingly)? II. For what causes can Masses be said on those days? For what causes can votive Masses be said on those days?

On account of public necessity. 2. If in that Church there should be celebrated a double Feast. 3. If it is exposed SS. Sacramentum. 4. If the body is present, or if it is to be said as an Anniversary Mass. 422 Qu.

III. An obligatus est dicere missam qui stipendium pro sacro accepit, tenetur dicere missam pro defunctis vel votivam vel in hoc aut isto altari prout pecuniam offerens petit vit (quantum tamen rubricae permittunt quibus neglectis ecclesiæ ordinem invertere ob alterius devotionem non convenit). Satisfaciat si dicat diei propriam. IV. What should be observed regarding the manner of saying Masses in relation to the obligation of celebrating votive masses made with a stipend? P And 1.

From the number of Prayers. 2. Concerning Masses having a particular entrance, etc. 3. Of Masses celebrated with the consent of the Saints for some Order, or in their place. 4. Regarding Masses 424, some notable Decrees are mentioned around the celebration of the Mass. It is casually inquired here, for what reason it is permissible to expose the Saints.

Sacramentum. All this refers to the preface of the Missal, Article 372, which deals with those matters that are to be explained in detail below. The rubric on page 1, title 20, reads thus: The altar in which the sacred Missal is to be celebrated must be of stone and consecrated by the Bishop, or at least an altar-like stone space similarly consecrated by the Bishop inserted therein, which shall be so spacious as to contain both the host and a greater part of the chalice. This altar operates by three mappas or tobaelis worlds consecrated by an Episcopus, or by another having power blessed, at least superior in length oblong, which reaches as far as the earth, two others shorter, or double the length of Pallium, which is also

adorned with a color suitable for the festal day or office. Upon the altar there should be placed a cross in the middle, and at least two candlesticks with lighted candles on either side thereof.

At the foot of the cross let there be placed a tablet called Secretarum: In the horn of the Epistle we have to place the Missal, and from that same part of the Epistle let a wick be prepared for the candle to be lit at the elevation of the Sacrament, a small campanula, ampulla in the horn of the Epistle we have to place the Missal, and from that same part of the Epistle let a wick be prepared for the candle to be lit at the elevation of the Sacrament, a small campanula, ampulla with vinegar and water with pelicularia, and manutergium in the window or on a small table prepared for these things. Upon the altar nothing at all should be placed that pertains neither to the Sacrifice of Mass nor to the ornamentation of this very altar. Response. These following: I. And indeed under a grave sacrilege is required an altar consecrated by the Bishop or Abbot (for it teaches presumptuously that altars, chalices, and bells can be consecrated for use in alien churches .3 tr. 2 res. 15 with Barbos and others.4 from the declaration of the Cardinal and privilege of Innocent III.) or by a privileged Priest, whether fixed or portable: both however must be entirely of stone as regards the upper table, which is to be consecrated; it should also be so large that it can contain a chalice with its paten.

It is not sufficient that Hostias be on the altar consecrated while they are being consecrated; but it is presumptuous to leave either a small one or a large one in the same place during the time of the Sacrifice and not elsewhere, although it may be placed above another corporal, for instance, due to the narrowness of the place: (It does not suit to place consecrated Particles outside before Communion: Arium; but rather after Communion, as Croix lib. 6 p. 1 n. 3 io with Quapropter rubricæ Missalis they wish to be placed above the corporal, either before or after the calice. Hence less correctly they presume, who, having completed the consecration, soon give to another Priest for distribution to the people hosts that they themselves have consecrated: because, congruent to the Priest, he should not do this according to Chapter III. Doubtful. IV. Of; Eucharist., as it is a sacrifice. 251 - to give His own victim, before He Himself shall have partaken, nor from others when there is one victim and one sacrifice, and all prayers, offerings, and blessings following them should regard both small victims just as much as the great; and the victim not be perfectly and integrally sacrificed before the reception of the priesthood who has acted otherwise, at least through mortal sin, or rather if necessity demanded its dispatch.

Excuse from the communion of the people, by all means excused.

Expedient of sacrifice chapter 5. » II. Mapa linea triplex; nam etiam secundum 374 «quosdam una duplicata», imo secundum. Sa, lib. 5 t. 5 c. 6 n. 17 una « simplex sufficiat in necessitate: Missale tamen Romae, auctoritate Clem. VIII. et editum a Pio V. expressè tres requirit, titulus de defectu utique et Gavant.

» And Cardinal de Lugo; That it may be blessed, is not necessary for anyone; as Sylv holds. » Wherein in necessity vulgarly it can be applied, and for other uses it can be rendered. ... cit. Let us repeat here what is prescribed in the rubric of the Missal: This altar should be covered with three mappas, or tobalis that are clean: one superior oblong, which reaches down to the ground (which however today is not in use), and two others shorter, or twice as long. But there is doubt 1.

Is it sufficient two mapps, or one doubled? Halam affirms, n. 371; likewise Bon.: Henr., et 322, even if these two Mappae do not cover the entire altar: The reason, as they say, is that it has thus been accustomed to be used. But I think it should not deviate from the Rubrica, as Lugo understands on day 20, n. 6.9 (where he says that the contrary opinion is not safe) and Escob. 1, 21, n. 434, who with Ang. et Avers. marvels that some DD do not notice this obligation after the aforementioned Rubrica prescribed by Clement VIII. The more so, because in the title, concerning defects, § 10 n. 4. Rubrica 252 Lib.

VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist—he enumerates among others this defect: If the altar is not adorned with three mapps. However, they add Probabiliter Escob; and celebrating however without any Mappa is not excused from a mortal sin, as commonly taught by the Doctors in the passage c. cum P. Dubit. 2.

Necessario debent esse Mappae bene dictae? They deny it, chapter 6 §2 n. 2., and Wig. tr. 15 n. 63. agrees, saying that blessing is made only from decency. Reason, because (as they say) it is neither guarded by any law nor observed by custom. This sentence does not appear improbable on account of the authority of these AA., especially Suaresii, who attests that custom is otherwise. Nevertheless, this notwithstanding, I adhere more to the opposite opinion than to that which is contained in 10 e. 28 q. 8.

Bone. o. 5 q. 5 cum Pasq. Reason, because as is prescribed in the Rubrica (as above) and numbered in title concerning defect n. 4, it is to be applied similarly for a defect due to the use of non-sacred Vestments and unblessed Mappas. Such a defect, however, as probably they say wherefore rightly they teach, and Tournay with Gavant. Sylv. et Quarti 11. cc.

nullum esse peccatum uti Mappis non benedictis in necessitate, puta (ut ait Escob.) si adsit dies festis, et non possint haberi benedictæ; Sed minorem causam sentio excusare, cum ad excusandum à veniali sufficiat quævis causa rationabilis. Doubt. 3.

The Mappae and Corporal ought to be lined with linen—either they should be made so, or it suffices that they are so? Tourn. p. 8 o 7 q. 9. . 8 sect. 6 Fill: t r. 5 n. 1 2 5. say, that it ought not to be made of linen, and they approve of it not being so. Consult - t o. 46 ubi sic dicitur: Sacrificium alarts non insericopunno (scilicet Corporali, ut explicat Glossa), aut tincto quisquam celebrare praesumat, sed in parolinto ab Cap. III. Doubt. V.

Of the Eucharist, since it is a Sacrifice. 255 Consecrated to the Bishop, namely linen generated [or: produced]. And from c. 27 of the first part on Consecration where it is stated: Mappae are called lintea, namely those made from linen. But it is more probable and most common to suffice, that they be made of reed, hold n. 24: and Cross n. 323. with Gob. Moreover chapter and arm. Table and note 446.

Reason, because reeds and flax are indiscriminately taken according to common usage. « III. Under a grave sacrilege, sacred vestments, that is, those blessed 35 times by a Bishop or Priest possessing the privilege, are used by at least the Superiors of Mendicants, or Prelates. V. . i c. 3. § 2 exped. sacr. » However, the colors thereof are not a precept, but a direction, notes » In a grave necessity, even though it may be offered if it can be done without scandal, the obligation to hear or celebrate Mass ceases then to omit it, it is permitted to celebrate Mass without vestments, or manipule, or to presume to use an unblessed cincture, or if broken to reconnect it again, or to use a stola instead of a manipule, or a manipule instead of a stola, teach Lay. 1.4 t. 5 c. 6, t. 1 l. 5 c. 5. who nevertheless allows in necessity without one or the other of the lesser things, for example. » to celebrate with a stole or girdle is not a mortal sin.

See t. 5 R. 62, where it is opposed to g., that one who celebrates Mass with a cincture not blessed, or uses something else in its place, Finally, it teaches from the Decretals, lib. 1, qu. 11, cap. 11, that out of fear of death or of very great damage, it is sometimes permissible to celebrate without sacred vestments and an altar, provided that this not be done in contempt of Religion. Sacrifice: l. i c. 5 § 1 in such a way as to permit without any presumptuousness from graver matters, yet not to be entirely dispensed with on account of scandal and irreverence. V. R. 48 and p. 5 t. 3.

R. 39, Porro hujusmodi sacra vestes confoere ex profanis, v.g. planetam ex

veste serica muliebri, non est prohibitum. exped. » Sacred law, book I, chapter 2, §4, which admonishes in said chapter §i, that care should be taken to prevent them from becoming very worn; lest also the remaining household goods suffer damage. » The sacred garment should be very unclean, in which a grave sin can easily be committed. Suar: Laymann. . c. * (in c. Relinqui, » de Cust. Thus it is understood: We command that the oratoria, vessels, corporalia, and vestments be kept clean and pure.

It is noted however a: i. Now as regards corporal vestments and other ornaments, they are to be sold only if they are not excessively dirty; indeed no sin at all, if others cannot be had, so that Croix n. 336 with ii does not say that those who used presumptuously an unclean corporal ornament out of necessity, namely if one himself or others ought to omit other things Sacred from the precept. The sacred vestments, presumptuously worn out for profane uses, are a mortal sin, as they say. 81 sect. 8 Sporer n. 414. And Wigandt letter 15 note 62. from chapter 39 and 43. concerning consent: question one. However, sacred vestments used for profane purposes do not lose their blessing; Honorius in Gemma, lib. i, dist. 89, reports that Clement decreed a lessened use of sacred vestments. But Baronius, Raynaud.

Bona, XIV. Not: 21 n. 6., they feel that the Apostles used peculiar vestments in the Sacrifice: and from such vestments they think thus. Calmet, Calmet, Visconti, etc., etc., to have been Penelope, whom D. Paulus mentions in Acts 16... But it is certain among all, that mortal sin to celebrate without any sacred vestments is doubted from chapter Vestimenta, de . Whether one commits a mortal sin by celebrating without a stole, or maniple, or girdle? They deny the pallium.

Sylv. Henr: and l. 21 n. 483. (who calls this probable) because they think, that this is not a serious matter; but in Cap. III. Give. V. Of.

The Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, more truly to be affirmed with the common opinion than otherwise, according to tract 5 chapter 5 notes 147 and 148. Bon, p. 9 n. 27. 1 c. 3 § 1 n. 3. Diana p. 2 tr. 14 R. 57, et cum Vasq. Reason, because, if either one of those two garments, which are commonly considered greater, is lacking, the worship due to the Sacrifice is deficient. The same must be said with regard to the celebrant wearing a stole or maniple that has not been blessed.

Nevertheless, a grave necessity probabily excuses, as they teach. II. cc. Wigant tr. tr. 15 n. 62. et et . I. c. item Vasq. Villalob. 14 R. 68. But they probably deny that it is permissible to celebrate without a stole, or without

one blessed, in Roncavo c. 6 q. 5 Sylvaius v.

Mass 1 n. 2. Sat. on the same day v. n. 10. and probable Lugo d. 20 n. 102. 14 R. 68. with Scotus, Palud. Henry with Pasch states that it is permissible for a celebrant to be without vestments, at least for those who do not use them to cover their heads but only their shoulders; and consequently, as he says in reply to Diana, there is no sin in celebrating Mass without a girdle or vestment, if they are lacking, provided that there be some reasonable cause for celebrating, namely fervor of devotion or the opportunity for almsgiving to the Priest who is not rich. Dubium secundum. An. on account of the fear of death, is it licit to celebrate Mass without any sacred vestment?

The first opinion affirms this, provided there is no contempt; and apart from that, see 1. 5 tr. 5 c. 6 n.; 17. Fourth part, page two, question four, doubt six. Esc. 1. 2; n. 489. Sylvius in tractato sexto, radix quarundam quaestionis quartae, dubitans de sexta. Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 330, Ratio; quia vestes sacrae requiruntur tantum de Ecclesiae praecepto, quod non obligat cum tanto dispendio; Secunda vero sententia, quam sequimur negat, eamque tenent Suar, d. 82 sect. 3 v. secundo a56 Lib.

VI. Tract. III. On the Eucharist. . on the Mass 1. 1 c. 3 § 1 n. 6. with Fagund, and Marchino, Tournai 1. c. with Merati, 13 likewise c. Reason, because it is scarcely possible to celebrate without any sacred vestment without contempt, as they themselves confess; hence Croix says with Aversa that in practice a contrary opinion is scarcely probable; moreover, because this cannot be done without scandal or at least with great irreverence; for which reason here enters the precept of natural reverence due in every case to the Sacrifice, from which precept fear of death does not excuse. Whether, however, on account of such a necessity it is permissible sometimes to celebrate without some presumptuous vestment from the greater ones, for example, the stole or the maniple?

They do not unreasonably affirm, with contempt withdrawn, that it is favored by the authorities and is in accordance with what will be said shortly in n. 377. 3 8 Dubit. 3. Whether regular prelates can bless sacred vestments? It is certain among all, that they can exercise this for their own churches, from many privileges granted to them accordingly. For (as it is referred to in I c. 2 § 2 n. 5) Innocent. VIII. Id concedit vivi vocis oraculo Congregationi S. Justine de Pa-pua, et consequenter aliis ejus privilegiis communicantibus: item Leo X. per Bullam hoc privilegium imperavit Fratribus Minoribus pro suo usu tantum; illudque confirmavit Xistus IV.

IV. excepting corporal blessings; but Alexander VII turned the question on the 27th day: namely, whether regular prelates can presume to bless for alien churches? The first opinion denies, and this is held by them. But when it was said, "Superiors," according to 1 part., 2 p., 1325 n. 27 and C. Rit. diei Augusti 24, 160g. (apud Gav.), Regularium, Cap. III. Dub.

V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Satiricium, 359 neither abbots can bless the offerings of churches not subject to them. Secondly, the wording of the statement affirms what they hold: with Anacl., and the same: he considers . c. n. 7 with Marchio, and for all regents excepted, as he says, only the superior members of the Society, and the Friars Minor, to whom a restricted privilege was granted by Leo K., as stated above. Neither does he say that it is an obstacle. C. quia constat de privilegio, non vero de ejus revocatione.

Translation: C. because it is certain concerning the privilege, not however concerning its revocation. But notwithstanding this; the first sentence from the aforementioned Decree of Alexander VII must be entirely retained (which Maratus and our Pope Benedict refer to). I. c.) quo sic sanctum fuit: Prelates inferior to Bishops, who enjoy the use of Pontificalia, may bless ecclesiastical furnishings solely for the service of their own Churches and Monasteries. Likewise it was declared: The remaining Pontificalia are subject to the Abbots outside their jurisdiction, or for alien service of the Church, or even in subordinates that are also alien, and they cannot exercise this without the permission of the Ordinaries, such as the blessings of bells, benediction of chrism, and similar things in which sacred anointing is used, nor minor orders' conferrals.

Because the aforementioned Prælati resorted to privileges for blessing paraments that belonged to other churches, the Sacred Congregation deliberated thereupon in their presence. But this Indultum, as Benedict attests, was never thereafter exhibited. Doubt. 4. Whether bishops can delegate to others the faculty of blessing sacred vestments? They deny. Miss. 1. 1 c. 3 §. 2 n. 4. and S.C. R. on November 14, 1615, where it was said: Neither can a Bishop delegate this blessing to others without license.

Reason, because this blessing is from the power of the Order, whence it cannot be delegated by the Bishop, can nevertheless be delegated the power of jurisdiction. But it contradicts 5 n. 33 where it is stated that this Decree does not authentically contain: That such a Decree is not in common use, especially in Rome, where the Vicar General frequently delegates to any priests the authority to perform this delegation; and that this blessing is not of Episcopal Order but of Priestly Order, and therefore can properly be delegated by the Bishop. It is added 1 n. 1 with Piringh in

Jus Can. 1. 1 tit. 29 n. 54. Bishops can properly delegate those things which competently belong to them by special privilege, on account of dignity; for since the power is annexed to the office, it passes into the ordinary jurisdiction. Nevertheless, I do not acquiesce to this opinion; for nowhere have I found that bishops of this kind have delegated such power to others: on the contrary (as Gav. states), many bishops took care to obtain it from the S. C.: and Benedict XIV, when he was Archbishop of Bologna, obtained this power for a five-year period, as he himself testifies in 1. e. - Dubit. 5.

Is there a color for vestments by precept? (According to the Rubrica Missalis on page one, title 18, number 1, it is thus stated: The paraments of the altar, the celebrant, and the ministers should be of a color suitable for the Office and the Mass of the day, according to the usage of the Roman Church) Tambur denies this in his book one, chapter three, section one, note one. Fourth p. i tit. 18 dub. i. . 2 tr. 14 R. 57 with Homobonus, also: And I think this to be more probable, according to our opinion to be adduced n. 399, namely that all the rubrics treating of things which accompany the Mass are preceptive. Therefore all the more, because the Rubrica says that this is the usage of the Roman Church. Nevertheless, they hold that it should be celebrated in black garments. Sporer addit satius esse quocumque die facere Sacrum in quolibet colore, quàm illud emittere; hinc rectè dicit à fortiori hinc rectè dicit à fortiori æcum Cap. III.

Doubt. V. From Eichardus, as it is a Sacrifice. §26: to remove every reasonable cause, so that if the attire of the priests does not suffice for the assembly. They, however, believe (Quarti 1. c. d. 2 et Merati t. 2 p. 1 p. 62g [contrary to Turrinum]) that the color croce, or yellow, is equivalent to every color because all are directed towards it. « IV! Under mortal sin requires catis; walking through con-3 seorata: if nevertheless in non-dedicated some one would have celebrated bonià; imò addunt Bordon. et hoc sitio celebrando peccasset mortaliter; probabile esse quod hoc ipsa consenantur consecrata, liceatque in iis celebrare; contrà de Lugó, et R. 6§ et p. 9 t. 7 R. 18 ex aliis octo.

The same is held regarding the Sacred vestments; likewise concerning the corporal, pyx, etc., which immediately touch the species, he holds. » sadr. 1. i c. 3 § r. » They inquire, whether the chalices and other things remain blessed if someone offers sacrifice with them using those that have not yet been blessed? The first opinion is more common and denies this, which those from Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 35i and others hold. And it calls this probable. i c. 1 § 4 n. 1. Ratio (ut ait. Augustinus apud ...: themselves dedicated to ministry, are called holy.

But it is one thing to be consecrated to sacred use, and another to be set apart for the Sacrifice; this latter being done solely through benediction. The second opinion however agrees with Diana, Con. Peyr. and others, whom he himself equally calls probable, affirm that said thing remains blessed, because through contact with species it already has an equivalent, nay eminent such designation; and this happens according to him, and the same is deemed probable for sacred vestments; and he says that the ornament of the altar must not depart from the first opinion, since Lugq d. 20 seot. 2 n! 62 commonly rejects it with merit, although it seems at least to be of doubtful probability. Verumque licet celebrare cum calice, non qui ex auro est? See what is said in note 370 d. 1.

And may one use a chalice made of brass or copper; or of alloy? See ibid. d. 3 at the end. 38. They however say "ap." Croix. 1. c. 4. 353 quod Abbates exercentes Pontificalia possint hendicere calices et indumenta sacra: indumenta pro suis tantum Ecclesiis, calices vero praesumptuose pro alienis. But observe the Decretum of Alexander VII taken from n. 378 dub. 3, by which it was declared that Abbots can only bless chalices, bells, etc., in which sacred anointing is used, and also sacred vestments, for their own churches, not for alien ones, without the license of the Ordinary.

That was confirmed furthermore by another Decree issued recently by our Father Benedict. XIV. at the request of Cardinal Spinelli, Archbishop. Newpolitans. Seek. II.

To whom is it licit to touch sacred vessels, corporeal things, or garments? No one doubts that except for priests and deacons, it is a mortal sin to touch sacred vessels containing the Eucharist, as commonly stated (contra Ochagavium, et Croix n. 360. et cum . 6 p. a n. 358. et perquam fusè id defendit Tamburin. Better. Miss. lib. 1 cap. 2 §. num. 12. cum Scoto, Barth. ab Ang. et Sa v. Sacred, n. 3. qui sic ait: Sacra tangi à laicis sine contemptu, aut nullum peccatum est, aut levissimum.

But the most common and more accurate opinion denies what they hold: Section 81, Chapter 8, Third Part, Article 31. Chap. III. Dub. V. D4 Euchar., ut est Sacrificium. 261.

Turner, t. 5, p. 8i8. Habert t. 5 p. 7og. Antoine p. 4g3 n. 10. et cum Vasq.: et Con. Sir teacher, laymen touching holy vessels to sin (but not more gravely than venially, since this matter is not considered serious; and even less so, if there be a reasonable cause, secluded from scandal and compulsion) as they demonstrate from c. In sancta. Concerning Consecration, where it is said: It is unfitting to serve as vessels for human

uses any sacred vessels of the Lord, whatever they may be; nor should they be entrusted to others (note) who are not servants of the Lord and treated by them as earthenware.

By such holy men are understood not only the Diaconi and Subdiaconi, but also the presumptuous Acolythes; as is evident from c. Non liceat de Conseor. dist. 23 ubi: Non de cat culibet Ministeria tangere, misi Subdiacono, aut Acolytho in Secretario vasa dominica. Furthermore, now those who have been tonsured according to introduced custom can touch these things, as they say in c. Croix n: 357 with Quarti, etc., and the same is taught by Bened. XIV. eum Pasq. This too has been granted to regular clergy as sacristans; from the privilege of Calixtus III, and the same is taught by Benedict. Sixtus IV. apud : c. n.: 130 et 131.

Nor likewise to Monastic Sacristans, by reason of the communication of privileges. .: 132 And today it can be said by custom that this is presumed licit for laicized Oblates of Congregations of Priests, secondary Sacristans, and all who serve in clerical habit in Churches; for they perform the duties of clerics in the Church: at least, I say, these are to be excused from guilt, because while they exercise the office of Sacristan, there is always some necessity of touching sacred vessels. And likewise, what has been said concerning the touching of sacred vessels must also be said concerning the touching of corporal things, as Merati says on page 313 with Quarti, Pasp., and the common opinion. Minimè autem peccant bacculi tangentes vestes sacras, aut alia non immediate attingentia corpus, et sanguinem. Christi, ut . Concil.: c. ex sententia (ut bene ait.

The text does not hinder that which is stated in c. Altaris, and c. Vestimenta, from the Lib. 362. VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist.

"For it is said: with Gross. in dec. altaris, verbo." Vela, quod si ibi aliquod præceptum est, hoc usu sit abrogatum. 383. « Ac licet doceas sit ut praesumptum pyxis sive ciborium et luna seu sphærula hierothecæ et quodcumque vas continens et immediatè tangens Eucharistiam ubi praesumptum secundùm 5 t. 5 c. 6 vasculum Chrisma continens benedicatur (benedicere ante tem præter ea in quibus unctio adhibetur potest idem; qui caetera ornamenta) cum in Rit. Romanum «. proprium sit pyxidis benedicto; id tamen necesse «. esse, negant . 11 exp. - » Sacrif. c. i § 6: nec esse necesse imponere pyxidi «. vas lineum benedictum benedictione corporalis. «. » Porro calix et patena confecti debent ex auro, «. argento vel stanno; saltem quoad cuppam (ad sit- «. tunt praesumptum aliqui ex plumbo) sed non ex ære, c. ut «. calix de conser. d. 1 *(Vide dicta n. 37o. dub. 3: » in fine) *. quàmvis . 1. exped. «. cum Hurt. Faga et Gav admittat praesumptum ex gemma, quæ æquè pretiosa: sit, ac aurum, vel

argen tum, modo: species non imbibat, nec sit pericu lum, ne effringatur. And although the Rubrica prescribes that at least the cup and the upper part of the patena be made of precious metal; nevertheless, it does not obligate this under mortal sin.

Gran. But neither under a venial sin does it wish, on account of the contrary use, c. 384. Dubium. 1. Does a pyxis need to be consecrated? They affirm; but more truly and commonly they deny. Chapter 5, section 6, note 22, and Croix with Ratio say that in the Roman Pontifical both a blessing is conferred upon the pyxis, but no mention is made of chrismation there. Likewise in the Roman Ritual, the blessing of the pyxis is noted among those things that do not require the anointing with chrism. 385 Dubit. 2.

Whether a pyx ought at least to be blessed by precept? The first opinion affirms this, and this is held by Tourn. Cap. III. Duh. V. de Euchar., tu es Sacrifice. 8 8 7. qu. 7. cum Sylio, cum Gav. et Reg. item Durand. . XIV. et Escob. 1. 22 n. 419. qui tamen putat, omissionem hujus benedictionis non excedere culpam, nepialem; Probatur ex Rubrica Missalis: p. a tit., 2: n. 3. ubi dicitur: Sacerdos est consequaturus plures hostias pro communionis facienda... locat eas super corporale ante calicam, aut in aliquo calice consecratorio, vel pace mundae benedicto.

Furthermore, it is proven by reason, because this is very fitting; for if the corporal, in which the sacred species remain for a short time, should be blessed, much more ought to be blessed the vessel, in which they are preserved both during the night and over an extended period? And thus in the Ritual a special blessing is assigned for the Tabernacle (as it is said there). For the vessel containing the sacred Eucharist, There is added doctrine D. 3, where it teaches that, indeed, it does not pertain to the layman to dispense. Eucharistiae tiae, dicit: In reverentiam hujus Sacramenti, d nulli re contingitur (Sacramentum) nisi consequat; unde et corporale, et calix consecrantur, et similiter manus Sacerdotis. However, the second opinion denies this, and many weighty authorities hold thus: namely, AA. n. 81, s. 7. Azor, p. 1. 1. 10 c. 27 q. 7.

Fillius de Sylva v. Euchar, 3 q. 4. they consider probable . 2: tr. 1 R. 180, and Lugo d. 20 n. 96. with Henry and Fag. Reason why (as they say) nowhere is there found an express precept concerning this; nor does the Pontifical determine us with certainty, since in it assignments are made. Benedictions praesumpta pro Campanis et Thecis Reliquiarum, quae tamen non de praecepto sed tam tum de congruentia benedicuntur. This, the second sense does not seem improbable at least by reason of the authority of so many DD.; but I consider the first to be more probable because it is

more conformable to the rubric and to reason; and therefore it is to be followed in practice, as rightly they say, and Bened.

II. cc. Debe dici idem de circulo seu lunula, ubi reponitur hostia consecrata, cum exponatur in ostensorio; 364... Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. 388... V.

The corporal linen (Or from sandalwood, as approved for use; see what is said at no. 375, dub. 3).* At least that part which touches the host or chalice, according to the Consulta on consecration d. i (for in the extremities silk or gold-embroidered may be used) and blessed by the Bishop or by one privileged. V. Commentary privilegium. Soc. JESU, v.

Bened. Nevertheless, it will not be blessed again after the anointing, nor will it be notably broken otherwise. St. Thomas Aquinas, Fourth Part of the Second Section, Question ultimate, Article last, Page nine. Lugo on the 20th day of the third section number 76. and * (See small note number 376.) * 387. It must be noted that to celebrate without a body; or with one that is not blessed, cannot be excused by a mortal sin, even if grave necessity urges the celebration, it is certain among all. Grave necessity urges the celebration, it is certain among all.

V. . 81 sect. 6 et Croix n. 333. Note II. This; which pertains to the consecration of the corporal. In c. Nemo 40 de Cons: dist. 1, Clemens Papa duo statuit: primum, ut sacrae palles tantùm à Diaconis laventur; secundum, ut lotio mittatur in Sacramentarium: quod ad primum pertinet, dicunt 81 s. 8 Merati t. 1 p. 1 n. 16 et Croix n. 334 cum Bon. quod licet convenientius sit secundam et tertiam lotionem pallarum (id est ut explicat Suarez; corporalium, parvarum pallarum, et purificationum) fieri à persona sacra, tamen nullum sit peccatum si ille fiant à laicis; prima autem lotio omnino debet fieri à Diaconis vel Subdiaconis, quia hodie horum Ordinis inter sacros numeratur; et ut eadem. DD. ajunt, hoc est peculiare officium Subdiaconi; imò probabiliter dicit Croix l. c. cum Nemo dicat: Diaconi cum humilibus Ministris lavent. Today, however, those clerics who have been tonsured are already counted among the lower clergy by custom, from which they are permitted to touch sacred vessels.

Whether, however, a layman would commit a mortal sin by performing this first lathering? They affirm, Villal. tr. 8 dif. 29 n. 5. But more commonly in Cap. III. Dub. V.

Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a sacrifice, Croix 1. c. and Quarti, censent, that to be only venial sin, and nullum, if just cause were present. As

regards however, Croix with Pasquale thinks that there is no sin if water from a lotion be cast not into the sacrarium but into some decent place. But it must be held altogether opposite to Merati, since in the aforementioned text, it is expressly stated that, if the lotion is ejected outside, there will be a sin on the part of the one performing the action. And he says, that no contrary custom can derogate from this. That, however, is understood only in reference to corporal things, veils, and purifiers; although the same is said about the white lotion and altar cloths in the text, nevertheless correctly says the Glossa there.

L. This has been abolished by general custom. « VI. The ball likewise, by means of a line, which part touches the cup, can be either of gold in its upper part or of silk; and since it has a common blessing with the bodily object, as formerly that part was capable of serving for the same purpose, so teaches the same Lugo. c. if it be sufficiently capable. The pallia ought to be made of linen, as required in the Rubrica p. 2 tit. 1 n. 1, or of flax, as we said regarding the corporal n. 375 dub. 3.

Wherefore Merati rightly observed that it is not well done for them to use a pallium made of papyrus or silk damask. But in the Decree S C. of the 22nd day of January 1706 (apud) it was said: a drapery of silk covered from the upper part should not be used in the sacrifice of Mass. Although P. 81 s. 6. thinks that it is not forbidden to use a silk or gold-embroidered pall only on the exterior part, and says that corporal only in extremities can be adorned with gold or silk; and this is probable, since in the Rubrica p. 2 tit. 1 n. 1. it is said: The corporal which should be made only of linen, neither with silk nor gold in the middle (note), but entirely white. The pall is to be blessed with the same blessing as the corporal, as commonly taught by Grav., in the aforementioned Suarez and Tourn. ll. cc. cum Quarti, and Vasq., who patiently refute the contrary opinion. Whether, however, it is a mortal sin to celebrate without a pall or with one that has not been blessed?

They affirm probably, c. Fill. n. 432, with Vasq. Reg. Reason, because formerly it was itself the corporal, with which the chalice was covered; hence, although today it is separated from that, nevertheless it remains equally necessary and blessed as corporal; and the Church, by permitting the separation, did not change anything regarding the matter and blessing. But rather very probably Sotus denies in 4 d. 13. qu. 2 art. 5., and Manuel, and Moure also although today the pall is separated from the corporal, yet the same reason does not apply to the corporal which immediately concerns the sacred species, as it does to the pall which does not concern it. They say however Sporer n. 308 and Croix loc. cit. with Gob., that if the pall is lacking, or expected by quadrant, another corporal may be used in

its place, or if this is deficient, a purificatory one, or a bursa. It is said, however, that this would have been an addition to the Rite, forbidden by Saint Pius V.

And to this opinion adhere Quartus and Megal. according to Merati tom. 1 p. 1 pag. 310 n. 12. Wherefore they say that Priests, who do not have this faculty from the Pontiff, cannot exercise these two functions. But they hold that not only Theatini to whom this privilege or usage was granted by Clement VII: but all foreign priests can avail themselves of them, because this is no addition, but rather some sort of accession to the Roman ones. Rite, ut majoris decet dignitatis, et ut frangimenta convenienter colligantur. Hence Merati with Pasqu holds that each one can follow this observance; and he refers to Cardinal Baronius as having granted it to someone for practical purposes.

Chapter III. Dub: IV. Offering of thanks, that is a Sacrifice. 267 i. VII. The purificatory line is likewise mentioned, yet not necessarily blessed, contrary to what Gav. and Lugo assert; nor is any blessing found in the Rituals for it.

». It is asked whether the purificatorium should be blessed? Laym affirms this in c. 6 n. 12. Likewise Franc. Lugo, et Fagund. apud Escob. l. 27 n. 434, qui huic opinioni adhaeret tamquam tutiori, licet contrariam etiam tutam voceti Ratio 1., quia, ut dixit D. Thom. l. c. n. 385: hoc Sacramentum à nulla re contingi debet, nisi consecretà. Ratio 2., quia rubrica præcipit ut benedicantur mappæ altaris; ergò tautò magis benedicendum purificatorium, quod fortè potest tangere reliquias sanguinis. It does not hinder that a particular blessing for purificatory purposes is not found in the blessings; for the blessing of linteas is taken for this purpose, its name being changed to calc if they are separately blessed for purification. But commonly, and more probably they deny it. 81 sect. 8.

Lugo dated 20th day, note 76. Croix n. 331. et Tourn. pag. 818 q. 9. cum Sylvio, qui dicit, hanc benedictionem fieri tantùm de conventuvenientia. Reason, because in the Ritual there is no proper blessing for purification, neither a veil nor a purse is congruent. Gratis autem asseritur eamdem benedictionem quam adhibetur pro mappis aptandam esse purificationibus, cum pro his nullo modo possint verificari verba Orationis quæ habentur in Rituali; scilicet, "consecrate digneris haec linteamina ad tegendum et involvensque altare Filii tui." Hence it is not sufficient (as the opponents assert) to merely change the name "altar" to "stone," but presumptuously one ought to change the words "to cover," "to wrap," which would be more properly a new prayer than a change; they

nevertheless say, c. quod, that although there is no obligation to bless the purifications, it can still be licitly blessed. If, however, purifications are not easily obtainable, Wigand pro habile says, tr. 15 p. 64. ac.

Advertemus et licitum esse sine eo a68 Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. It is possible to celebrate and use a clean cloth in its place, which subsequently shall not be devoted to profane use. « VIII.

Under a grave sin, the Missal; the Canon also containing it, as it has, and thus Lugo loc. cit. » when Diana etc. probably excuses him who because of probable debility cannot read due to vision. debility cannot read due to vision. » (The secretarium table is not required by precept, but merely for the greater convenience of those celebrating; as well says.) » Is asked whether it is ever licit for priests to celebrate without a Missal? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Habert in tom. 5 p. 708. Also at 21 n. 462. Even if someone knows firmly by heart what ought to be said. Reason, because in so grave a matter it is necessary that every danger of erring be avoided, which can always be feared when reciting memoriter.

That is seen to be confirmed from the fact that the Sacred Constitution of the Council (as reported by Blessed). XIV.), by granting permission to a blind priest to celebrate twice in the feast Mass, he who has received stipend for the Sacred, is bound to say a Mass for the dead, either votive or otherwise, in this or that altar, according as money was offered (provided always that it be within the limits permitted by rubrics; neglect of which would invert the order of the Church for another's devotion, which is not fitting). de BB. Virginibus et feriis pro defunctis Missam solito clausulam hanc apponere: Quod non sit omnino cæcus, et memoriter non recitet. The second opinion, however, is commonly held, which Lugo holds on the 20th day, note 78., chapter 81, section 6. . Vasq. d. 233 c. 3. in fine, Diana p. 2 tr. 14 R. 46. cum Avers. cum Villal. cum Vericelli, et Gobat. probabiliter dicit, posse quandoque Sacerdotem celebrare sine Missali, si hoc facile non posset habere, et ob præteritam experientiam abesset morale periculum errandi.

From this, Lugo and Escob. probably infer that a Priest may licitly celebrate Mass when, on account of visible bodily weakness, he remembers to recite the Missal, provided he discerns the chalice; Cap. III, Dub. V. Cum Avers. cum Villal. cum Vericelli, et Gobat. probabiliter dicit, posse quandoque Sacerdotem celebrare sine Missali, si hoc facile non posset habere, et ob præteritam experientiam abesset morale periculum errandi. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 266; so much suffices to avoid irreverence; and let the Missal on the altar, or another book in place thereof, have regard to the mode, as Croix n. 364 says with Gob. By the

clause, which is usually appended by the Sacred Congregation, as mentioned above, this second opinion, namely improbable, does not suffice to be sufficiently proven; yet it will always be safer to obtain this faculty from the Sacred Congregation. It is certain among all, that a completely blind priest illicitly to celebrate is; although Benedict refers in loco citato on the day twenty-third of August 1727.

Sacram C. Concilii hanc licentiam concesse, cuidam Parocho pauperi ex speciali gratia, cum assistentia tamen Sacerdotis. However, the priest. The Roman Rite would gravely sin if it used the Missal of Regulars in their Churches: or in places which pass through, saying Mass according to different Rites, as rightly Croix thinks with Pasq. Fourthly, and Aversa (against C. 19 nov. 1622 ap. Hoc tamen intelligi- tur, si talis Sacerdos posset Ritum suum servare: nam aliàs licitè posset uti peregrinus Ritu et Missali illius Dioccesis in qua reperitur, ut probabiliter ait idem Croix n. 368 cum Con. Olim Missalia habentia in canone pro Rege nostro erant suspensa; sed hodie rectè dicit Croix n.: 36q. cum aliis recentioribus, in hoc non esse fa- ciendum scrupulum ex consuetudine introducta.... Confessarii autem et Capellani Monialium possent quidem dicere Missas Sanctorum de quibus ipsa recitant Officium, non tamen Missas proprias illius Or- dinis sed cum Missali Romano et de communi; ità S. C. R. annuente Clem.

Eleventh day, first number, one thousand seven hundred and eight... First tenth. Minister, according to. Zero.l. under 3 mortal, and indeed male; in a very pressing necessity, for example on a feast day, or when giving alms, one might respond for himself, they say, Sa, Bonac. et. . 14 res. 43 ex aliis. In what case it teaches that a presumed minister can be admitted to administer 1 and Syc. "This is also taught to have been introduced by custom in certain parts of Belgium, c. Tambur."

» 1. c. et March. de ord. t. 3 c.:5, ubi vult hoc peccatum esse mortale. Ministrante tamen circa altare viro; qui nesciat respondere, Moniales ex choro respondere non esse prohibitum notat Card. de Lugo et c. ubi praesumptum cum.. Dubitatur r. quale peccalum sit celebrare sine ministro? It is certain among all, to be mortal, according to chapter Proposuit 6 de Fil. Priest when it is said: For the priest cannot celebrate the solemnities of Mass without the suffrage of a minister alone. It is commonly said by the Doctors that it is licit to celebrate Viaticum without a minister in urgent necessity of administering it.

Thus Lugo, in his work of the twenty-ninth day of November, number one hundred three, treating on chapter fourteen, section four十三 Villal. et significo. v. Hereupon, and Sylvius 3 p. q. 83. And the same [doctors]

allow Tournely, Lugo, and Diana along with others cited by them, that the people may hear Mass from a precept: but as for celebrating it, Diana excuses the presumption that he who celebrates Mass hears it himself from a precept alone. And Tournely with Sylvius does not condemn, although he does not approve.

They nevertheless say probably (excepting Lugo and Tambur). Henry and Tournely, p. 825, and especially if there has been a consecrated offering, let it be permitted to the celebrant to proceed without a minister, if this one has absented himself, and let him return quickly thereafter. They probabilistically presume that the celebrant should not form scruples if the minister pronounces incorrectly, nor easily correct errors, lest he disturb himself, those present, or the order of the Mass; although Croix with Gob. advise that the celebrant supplement what has been omitted by the minister. It is said however, no. 3go. with Fourth, regarding the Rubrics concerning Bitumen to be observed by the minister, Chapter III. Dub.

V. Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, 371 to be merely directives and not to entail guilt; but I do not agree with this. Rationabiliter vero advertit Lugo d. 20 num. 303, minorem necessitatem sufficere ad celebrandum cum ministro nesciente respondere, quam sine ministro. But that which is found in c. 6r where Soter Pope says thus: This also has been established: that no presbyter presume to celebrate the solemnities of the Mass unless two be present with him who respond for himself; and a third is counted as present, because when it is said by Him pluraliter, "The Lord be with you," and "Pray for me," and "Pray for me," it is most clearly fitting that a response be made more deliberately to the salutation.

They explain D. n. 640 to mean this by the Solemn Mass. In missis tamen privatis (aure Thomas) sufficit unum habere ministrum, qui gerit personam totius populi catholici, ex cujus personae sacerdoti pluraliter respondet. There is doubt. 2. Whether a priest celebrating sinned gravely by responding with a woman named No. 392? Nuns affirming this according to Diana in the second treatise, chapter fourteen, page forty-four.

But commonly they deny it. Section 88, chapter 2. Tournely page 825 verso. Hereupon, and Diana at loc. cap. de eodem Mulf. 15 num. 69. Tournely with Lugo and the watering-pot, etc., this indeed cannot be excused by a mortal, according to the chapter 1. By inhibiting from Cohac.

Clr. ubi feminis omnino interdictum est ministerium celebrandi ministrare. And thus he rightly observed: "Crucified; unless it be from the Venerable Sacramento, yet not nevertheless under a grave obligation;" the same is

said about the veil, Lugo d. 29 sect. 2 num. 79. » Gavant. » In the rubric of the Missal on page x letter 20, this alone will be found: On the altar, let the cross be placed in the middle, and at least two candlesticks on either side. But it was decreed by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the day of May 14, 1717 (among Merati's works, volume 1, page 2 in the Index number 605): Upon the altar, within which SS.

The sacred sacrament is such that the cross ought to be placed according to custom with an image of a crucified person affixed to it. That nevertheless is to be understood, as Merati says in Tom. 1, p. 1, page 693v. Above, only while the Mass is being celebrated. Moreover, it is prescribed thus in the Ceremonial of Bishops 1:2 c. 12: A small cross with an image of the Crucified over the tabernacle, in which the Most Sacred Host is kept. The sacrament on the altar is not sufficient for the Mass, but another cross ought to be placed in the midst of the candlesticks.

This was confirmed by the Sacred Congregation on June 16, 1663, at Merane according to the aforementioned. Index number 400. But it is doubted i. Whether it is a mortal sin to celebrate without the Cross? They affirm that in question 15 of Renzi chapter 4 and in question 11 section 3 of Aversa, it is stated because the matter is serious, since in the sacrifice of the altar the sacrifice of the Cross is represented: but they commonly deny it in section 3 of chapter 81.

Tournely page 809. Merati t. i p. 1 pag. 297. et Caetorum nullo modo excusari potest saltem a venialis sacerdos, qui celebrat sine cruci, ex Decret. ubi dicitur: Ut nullo modo fiat sacrificium, nisi crucifixus inter candelabra. id promineat, ut sacerdos ac populus eundem crucifixum facile et comode intueri possit: et imago non sit id tenuis et exigua, ut ipsius sacerdotis et populi oculos pende effugiat. The same is prescribed in the Ceremonial of Bishops. And the Sacred Constitution on Rituals decreed presumptuously, in the altar where the exposition is placed Ven. The sacrament is to be placed with the Cross set up according to the image of a Crucifix, as is found in Meratum and La Croix, lib. 6, p. 2, n. 321.

The crucifix on the altar is not required with such strictness as the cross itself is required, for by the mere cross there is already obtained the sacrifice, Chapter III. Dub. V. De Eachar., ut est Sacrificium. - 295 eruenti representatio; ita Bissus apud Merati p. 295 et Dubitatur 2. If there is a statue of the Crucified on the altar, is another rooster required?

They affirm 75 n. 53, because from the rubric it is required that the Cross be placed among the candlesticks. But it is not to be negated, that she is

required in the Caeremoniale Episcoporum 1. cit., where it is said: But on the altar, on which a great statue of SS. is present. Crosses are not necessary to be placed at a high elevation when Mass is celebrated. That was confirmed by the Decree of the Sacred Congregation no. 400. And likewise it must be said concerning the depicted image of the Crucified, write Pasqualig., Quarti and Giribaldus according to the Decree of S.C. as Bened refers.

XIV. In the Cross however there should not be blessed according to the Decree. Holy See, July 12, 1704, at 297. And the same teaches « XI. A lighted candle double, made of wax, specifically 3 5 according to Fag. However, in necessity I command: "A lighted candle suffices even from tallow, or a lantern from oil."

See Dionysius: I. q. 15. Without any light at all, it is never permitted to celebrate; Lugo d. 3 o sect. 2 n. 77. so much so that if it were extinguished before consecration and another could not be had, the mass should be left, even in necessity of consecrating for a dying person as viaticum, thus it is said In Rubrica p. 1 t. 20: Thus it is held: Upon the altar let there be placed at least two candelabra with candles lighted here and there on either side. It is certain among all, that a mortal sin is committed by celebrating Mass without any light, according to the chapter on Letters ultimae de celebrat., 6 q: 5. Tournely p. 809 q: 11. cum Bellarm, item Lugo, Quarti, etc., apud Renzi o. 4 qu. 17; et idem sentit Croix n. 392 (contra Pasq.; cu- jus tamen opinio ipse Croix probabilem putat). Unde recte censent cc. ac 4: Renzi c. 4 qu. 17 (contra Croix n. 392 cum Gob et Leand. Lugo autem d. 20 n. 77 et sæculi si post consecrationem.

In what case, if the candles can be relighted, he himself says and it is also to be said there. Quintana d., si candelaæ non possint ita facile reaccendi, ut expectandum sit ad quadrantem, ob eamdem rationem. But he says that it is to be recited from extinguisht candles: "There is no sin," says the Fourth Council of the Lateran, n. 397, because such Evangelium is not part of the Mass, for it is said after "Ite missa est." But they more probabily say that candles should not be extinguished except after the Evangelium, as the Rubrica truly prescribes; for although this Evangelium was formerly recited at the discretion, yet today, as Butrius and others observe commonly, it is recited out of obligation, by command of S. Pius V. No; however, the priest ought not to extinguish the candles while reading the Gospel.

Item probabiliter ait Croix n. 398 quum Sporer dicit pullam esse obligationem accendendi tertiam cande- lam post Sanctus; sic enim hodie communis usus habet. It is doubted. 1. Whether it is licit to celebrate with

candles made from fat or oil? Toletus affirms caput 2 numquam 12. But commonly the Doctors teach that this is mortal sin, because such use is most indecent and utterly foreign to the universal custom of the Church.

And this is presumed in necessity, as they perceive. . 81 sect. 6 (speaking here of tallow candles) and Escob. 1. 21 n. 457 with Villal. et Fag. But commonly and probably [it is so], according to 1. 10 c. 27 quæst. 15. Wigandt tract. 15 n. 63. Chap. III. Dub.

V. De. 375 Tourn. l. n.: Sporer n. 383 cum: Tann. et : 31 cum Vasq. dicunt, licitum esse celebrare cum oleo, vel sebo in necessitate; et probable putat et alii, (quibus consentit Suarez loquendo de lumine ex oleo); nempe non esse illicitum celebrare cum candelis ex oleo, vel sebo, praesumptum ex sola devotione, si aliae haberi non possint; nam haec non videtur causa gravis sufficiens ad excusandum à mortali, ut supra dictum est. It is doubted 2. Whether it is licit to celebrate with one wax candle! Fagundez contra Roncaglia, c. 6, q. 5, nega esto y dice que esto es mortal.

On the contrary, 15 and Vasq, Con. But I think more probably and commonly with Tournely, p. 809. R. to 3, n. 453, who cites Franc. and Lug., saying that it is only a venial sin; from whom I think any reasonable cause, still under devotion, secluded from scandal, can be excused. But it must be noted here that it is neither permitted nor presumptuous for any Vicars General to celebrate with four candles, as the Sacred Congregation declared on August 7, 1627; and similarly, this has been forbidden to other Priests unless they are Cardinals, Bishops, or Abbots possessing the use of the Pontificals; only then, and solely when celebrating themselves, is it permitted according to the Decree of February 9, 1675, in the XIV. « XII. Is required presumptively antipendium, pulvillus, candelabra 395, bursa, velum, manutergium; but not blessed: and if anything from these is lacking, it can be suitably taken from the profane, and then returned to its proper use. . 1 cap. 1 § 3.

It is rightly said by Busemb. that these are not blessed because they are required solely for decency. It is thought that celebrating Easter without an antipendium does not constitute a sin, especially if it is omitted due to poverty; but Fourth [i.e., Quarti] at Croix n. 326 says that it is venial, and I believe this to be correct. VI. Treatise. Two.

On the Eucharist. More probable, when it is required by the Rubrica t. 19 n. 20, where it is stated: The altar is also adorned with a pall, of whatever color it may be, on the feast day or office corresponding to the day. However, altars are to be accepted made of marble, or those which are

commonly called all'Altaria Paolina, whose use has today become very common. It is required as presumptively public from the same Rubrica: In the turn of the Epistle (let it be placed) a cushion supposably under the Missal. Bened verò pro cussino licite subrogatur legile, vulgò lector in o: item manutergiam cum pelvicula: Parentur. ampulla non area, vel vitrea, nulla mentione facta de inauguratione vilt, et aqua cum pelvicula, et manutergio mundo. Of veil and bursa it is said in Rubrica tit. i n. i. "The veil (the priest's stole) is lined with a small piece of silk cloth."

Upon the Veil he places a Bursa colored with dyes whose initials contain the word "parametorum," folded corporally. Wherefore they do not act rightly who carry the corporal outside the Burse, as correctly says where it refers, St. Pius V having dispensed with the Spaniards, that the corporal may be carried outside the Burse. Croix autem dicit in IIII. 330., quod celebrare sine Velo, quando nullum habetur, non sit peccatum, nam Velum, Manutergium, Pulvillum ait requiri tantum ob decentiam: Et idem censet de Bursa cum Sporer: IIII. 33. XIII. It is not permitted to celebrate with a covering on the head without permission, presumptuously out of infirmity, as Fag. and even the Supreme Pontiff teach, as Gav. notes from the Declaration of Cardinals, who rightly limits it to the case of necessity; in which recourse to the Pope is difficult.

He, however, who should do so without permission would not sin mortally, secluded in contempt and scandal, he desires. 1. cit. Which he considers probable, if the time of the Canon is excused. Certain it is, that this is not allowed ex c. Nullus; from which it is said: No Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon shall presume to assist at the altar of God with a covered head, Cap. III. Dub. V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 277 Urbani VIII added a precept in the Roman Missal approved, in which he prescribes: No one shall dare to celebrate Mass on the altar without express license from the Apostolic See, notwithstanding any contrary thing.

But Boni notes in n. 400 that this precept does not obligate the Chinese, among whom it is customary to cover: the head is the sign of reverence; and to uncover is an act of irreverence. And yet, if it be a mortal sin to do so. The sacred with a tuft, valgo, and dioto Beratio. A Affirmant: Angel. V.

Mass and armilla are the same: what do they think this is made of, a heavy material, since it heavily resists generation? Sacramenti. They indeed deny. Idiota, et hoc putant probabile. But no, probably.

Fourth part, question 2, article 2, doubt 3. Dialog. 69. q. 826. et cum

Villate et Fira. Lugo, besides what was mentioned above about the prolonged and they say it to be mortal. to celebrate entirely. Mass in alley near. Gap thee, otherwise if until. To. Canonem secus conjectum et sequendo; Et censequente. Probabile est id quod dicunt. Cum Sa, Vasq., Sylvest., et ad Dic. nempe non esse illicitum sine dispensatione celebrare cum pileolo (excepto canone et ipraeeiis scandalo). Ex rationabili causa si celebretur in loco: privatio vel si causa ita celebrandi adstantibus sit manifesta, puta ob senectutem Sacerdotis vel loci frigio. Ita ut quis non posset celebrare gapi te hudo sine notabili incommodo.

Hereupon they say, Tourney, page: 826. Parisii, et Vasq. ap. Cross, during the winter time in Cologne, to deliberate with the prelate until early morning. That likewise is approved. Benedictus XIV de Sacrificio. 6. 7 et 9. at least for him who labored more heavily!

Disease; and he does not say that the statute of Urban VIII prohibits it, for it is not to be considered; Rather, he says: The Apostolic Seat in its extremity and concerning this disease, which is minimally prolonged, declare this illicitly. "They say however, section 82, third part, and also Sa, likewise Spbr." Fill. Rodrigo, and others say. Cross d. n. 400. quod, accedente causa, v.g. infirmitatis, possit Episcopus vel Prelatus.

Order 287... Lib. VI. Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. Not to give permission for celebrating with a covered head or with a veil or a pilosus.

But this must be denied with Gavant and Averas, according to the same Croix, from the Decree cited by Urban VIII where it is expressly stated that all are prohibited from sacrificing with a pileolus without Apostolic dispensation. That is confirmed by the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on April 24, 1626, in which it was stated: The faculty of granting the use of a pileus during Mass pertains to the Pope. Item obiter notandum aliud Decretum ejusdem S. C. 13 Aug. 1605 ubi: Parochis ministraturis Ss. The sacrament is not a license for the sick to use a small pileus on a daily basis without special permission from the Sacred Congregation. Dubitatur 2.

Whether it is licit to celebrate with artificial hair, commonly called a Peruke. 3. There is the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites published on August 3, 1625, in which it was stated: The Mass cannot be celebrated with a false wig. It is said to be permissible: to celebrate with a reasonable cause with that [i.e., with a false beard]. But Croix noted number 40 r., that this presumptuous thing is today prohibited by the Decree of Innocent XI promulgated in the Diocese of Cologne on March 21,

1689, where it was declared that bishops and Apostolic Nuncios cannot grant permission to priests to carry such combs during the act of celebration; prescribing for all and each out of respect so due to so holy a Sacrifice, that they presume to assist with uncovered and bare head only when detected; and this under pain of suspension from Divine offices. « Further on these matters see at Auct. cit: Bonac. Card. de Lugo d. 20 sect. 4. n. Esc.

Exemplum rationis numeri ubi notat, etsi sit gravis obligatio servandi ritum celebrandi praescriptum in rubricis n. missalis, ideoque grave sit omittere, v. gr., offertionem nempe hostie vel calicis vel infusionem modicae aquae (de exped. sacr.). I. 2 c. 5.) nihilo minus levitatem materiae saepè excusare à culpa mortali omissionis, praesumptum intra Canonem, monet Escob. I. c. ». 39 It is asked, whether the Rubrics of the Missal are directed solely for the purpose of instruction, or whether they are preceptive and binding to avoid culpable omission? Above all in this point, Chapter III. Dub.

V. Concerning the Eucharist, which is a Sacrifice. 479 to be noted beforehand what is contained in the Bull of Saint Pius V appended to the front of the Missal, where it is said thus: Ordering and strictly enjoining all and singular, by virtue of Holy Obedience, that henceforth, for all other reasons and rites found in other Missals, they entirely omit them, and celebrate Mass according to the rite, mode, and norm which are treated in this present Missal. Neither additional ceremonies nor prayers, other than those contained in this Missal, are presumed to be added or recited in the celebration of Mass. To the sought-after four sentences proceed the Doctors, who on this point speak confusedly. The first sentence, which those 81 hold under the defeated party, says that all Rubrics are directives, although they themselves do not command; but rather they consult or instruct.

But this opinion justly they reject: Quarti qu. procemial. act. 2 p. 1. et victorian. in Memor. Second opinion, which they hold. . Section three, chapter eighty-three. Azores tome I librum 10 caput 20 quaestio 6. Bonaventura, distinzione 4, quaestio ultima, pagina 7, sezione 3, nota 3: quando Lexicarius et Molfetta, secondo Merati, 6.1, pagina 2, pagine 786 dicono che tutte le rubriche siano precepitevole dalla detta Bolla di S. Pio; Dovendo pertanto pensare che tutte le rubriche siano obbligatorie in virtù del loro genere e possano solo essere trasgredite per una materia leggera, si commetta un peccato veniale. The third opinion, which Lugo holds in d. 20 n. 105. v. 506 n. 1.

Sporer from n. 423. 86 n. 376. 268. Diana p. 2 tr. 14 R. 70. Renzi c. 9 q.

14. When he states that rubrics are either preceptive or directive: For they say that those rubrics are preceptive in which the word graviter peccat is appended, or which are otherwise prescribed by law or custom; these rubrics manifest the integrity of the Sacrifice, its matter and form, fasting, vessels, vestments, etc. But directives are such as, for example, to pray before or after Mass; the number of collects, washing of hands, genuflexions, crosses, etc. Ex aetoris.. Lib. VI. Trace.

Two. On the Eucharist. But as to these opinions, some, like Concina, hold that the rubrics are directives under grave precepts but under light ones; Yet this doctrine does not suit their peace; for it is repugnant to say that rubrics are merely directives and bind to sin; because, if they bind, they should rather be called precepts than directives. Therefore let others say it better, as Gavaut does. Lugo, : The fourth sentence which I follow and Merati holds on page 787. Tournely page 81 recto versum.

Resp. et Quarti d. qu. pronem. sect. 2 p. 2. distinguere rubricas in eas, quae sperantur intra missam sive in metu celebrationis, et in eas, quae serventur extra ex 7. Chapter 13 nbi states: If anyone says... that the approved rites of the Church are to be either despised or contemned in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, or without sin by ministers according to their own will or for novices: let him be anathema if any others can be changed. It is certain that the celebration of Mass pertains to the administration of the Sacred Sacrament of the Eucharist presumptuously. It is proven and more explicitly stated in the Bull of S. Pius, where it was thus said: Ordering and strictly commanding all, by virtue of Holy Obedience, to chant and read the Mass with just rite, manner, and norm as prescribed in the Missal; then it is added: Nor are they to add or recite any other ceremonies or prayers in the celebration of Mass. From which it is evident that the first proposition is false, and the opinion of Pellizarii and Renzii is not upheld, who said that this Bull does not oblige under a grave penalty, because in itself it merely prohibits the introduction of new rites, but not the change or variation of chants or prayers; for the Bull indeed contains two distinct precepts, and commands (since it strictly enjoins and through the virtue of holy obedience), one of not adding other ceremonies, and another is found in Chapter III.

Pub. V. [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] [TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions]

Treatise. Two. On the Eucharist: another grave offense of irreverence towards the Sacrament, and a scandalous act towards the people. And lest we seem to speak without foundation, we call upon the touchstone and the test, taking the thing from its own principles., taking the thing from its own principles. It cannot be denied that all those things pertaining to the ceremonies within the Mass, as specified by Rubrice, are preceptive, as we have proven in n. 399 with Tournely, Quarti, and Merati, from Pii V., where it is strictly prescribed that the rite, manner, and norm prescribed in the Missal be observed and read in the desired obedience.

From these words: being thus divided and in virtue thereof, there is no doubt that such a precept concerning the ceremonies of Mass is indeed grave. Therefore, it is fitting who omits it. In matters concerning the liturgy; a light fault does not excuse one from a lighter offense, just as in matters of gravity, a grave fault will not be excused, as we said above with Croix, Roncag, Wigandt, and Concina. It is impossible to celebrate Mass within a square, such that either the words or the ceremony are omitted; or at least so it is taught that the doctrine and gravity so due to such Sacrifice notably diminish. This must be diligently observed: for who, indeed, has said that he himself will pronounce the words of the entire Mass correctly and will fulfill all the ceremonies of the Mass well?

Indeed, although someone may be given such fluency of speech and movement that within such a time he satisfies all the words of the Mass and all its ceremonies; nevertheless, it is morally impossible that this celebrant not notably detract from one part of reverence which he shows forth: towards the Sacrifice, and in another way, that he himself not be the cause that the people present do not fall into veneration which is due to that same Sacrifice. Now speaking first of the reverence which the celebrant himself should show towards the Mass, the Council of Trent teaches us in Session 22: With what care it is to be exercised that the most holy sacrifice of the Mass be celebrated with every religious cult and veneration, he who is constrained to consider this can easily judge to be a cursed work in sacred letters for one who performs the work of God negligently. If we concede the necessities, no other work has suddenly and divinely hated labor from Christ, Chapter III. Dub. V.

Of the Eucharist; since it is a Sacrifice. 20: that which can be treated with the faithful, namely this very tremendous mystery:... it prepares an excessively presumptuous appearance; all effort and diligence must be placed in it, so that as much as possible interior purity and innocence of heart, and more exact species of devotion and piety may be carried out. Therefore he adds: Since now there is no longer any avoidance either of temporal vices and iniquities which offend against the dignity of so great a

Sacrifice, that the due honor and worship may be restored to God for His glory, and the faithful people for their edification, the Holy Synod decrees that the Ordinaries of places prohibit all such things, and diligently remove them—those things which arise either from avarice (the servitude of idols), or from human vice and iniquity, which are alien to so great a Sacrifice's dignity, so that due honor and worship may be restored to God for His glory, and the faithful people for their edification. Therefore the Holy Synod decrees that the Ordinaries of places prohibit all such things, and diligently remove them—those things which arise either from avarice (the servitude of idols); or irreverence which is scarcely to be followed due to its deficiency in completeness (notable), or superstition: (a false imitation of true piety). Therefore the first Council declares the malediction pronounced by Jeremiah 40 upon those who negligently perform the divine liturgy to be understood as a fulmination against priests celebrating without due reverence and gravity; adding: this kind of negligence, for it is almost impossible to follow an order of irreverence which comes from impiety. Si autem Caeremoniae in Missa ad eum finem ab Ecclesia praescribuntur, ut debita praestetur reverentia erga tam venerabile Mysterium, ipsas exhibendo cum eo decore et gravitate, quae majestati tanti Sacrificii conveniunt; quomodo umquam levis censeri poterit irreverentia Missae irrogata ab eo celebrante, qui tam celeriter illam solvendo non poterit celebrare absque plurimis defectibus, nimirum quin verba, benedictiones, et genuflexiones mutilet; quin indecener se moveat: et convertat, et quod magis dedecet; quin verba cum aer en o niis complicet, aut ipsa contra Rubricarum praescriptum anticipet vel postponat? Which thus acting cannot but notably detract from the intrinsic decency of the Sacrifice which demands that not only be the ceremonies discharged, but be discharged with gravity convenient thereto, which within so brief a space cannot be applied.

This which the celebrant himself ought to render in respect of reverence. With regard to the veneration to be rendered in respect thereof, by those present at the Mass; attend to what is handed down likewise by the Tridentine sessions, 22. c. 5 de sacrif. Since it is the nature of men that they cannot easily elevate their minds to the meditation of divine things without external aids, therefore the pious Mother Church instituted certain rites and ceremonies, including mystical blessings, etc., according to Apostolic discipline and tradition, so as to commend the majesty of this great Sacrifice, and by these visible signs of religion and piety, which excite the contemplation of the most high things contained in this Sacrifice, may the minds of the faithful be excited to the contemplation of such high matters. Therefore, the Council teaches congruently that for this sacred sacrifice ceremonies have been instituted, so that through such things according to Apostolic discipline and tradition, the majesty of this

great Sacrifice might be commended, and the minds of the faithful excited to contemplation of the most high things which are latent in these mysteries by means of visible signs of religion and piety. Let the faithful advert to the majesty of the Sacrifice and the sublimity of its mysteries. But since such leisures are exhibited less hurriedly, it is indeed fitting that they be completed within so brief a time, and moreover, they do not merely interfere with the due veneration towards the Mass to a minimal extent, but also serve as a cause why the people's due veneration should be increased.

Therefore, since the end of the Ceremonies is grievously set, the Priest cannot be excused from a grave fault on account of a grave scandal which he offers to the people. And therefore, the Council of Tours appointed in the year 1583 a precept, that priests be well instructed in the ceremonies of the Mass, lest they turn the people from devotion to them, which is directed towards the meditation of sacred and ineffable mysteries, and the due veneration thereof. Qui autem cum excusiva festinatione, et consequenter sine convenienti; decentia Missam persolvit, non solum non iuvat assistentem ad contemplanda mystaria, nec ad exhibendam eis debitam veneratiorem, sed potius invitat ad veneratiolem abjiciendam; imo potius adstantium mentibus tentationes adversus fidem ingerit, auferendo, aut saltem immiuendo credulitatem, quod ibi Christus Dominus realiter adbit, dum spectant, Eum tam irreverenter a celebrante recognitum. And this indeed is that scandal and nightmarish thing which cannot be excused by grave fault. Chapter III.

Doubt. V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 585 - Thus the matter stands; but alas, how many Superiors are there, and how many Priests, who cast such scruples upon themselves? The Preachers exclaim, the correctly teaching Scriptures exclaim, that a great deprivation of alms will occur, and consequently that the absolution of Masses cannot be excused within a quarter from a grave sin; but how many are there who have care to avoid this? Corruptionis hujus generis non calamo sed lacrymis persequi oportet, dum quotidie cernimus, non so- lume maximam partem Sacerdotum saecularium hoc tremen- dum Sacrificium peragere pejus quam tractant res temporales levioris momenti ita oscitantiter ut nullam de tanto Mysterio fidem habere videantur sed quod deplorabilius etiam Religiosi adhuc arctiris observantiae qui in aliis rebus spiritualibus agendis magnam diei partem insumunt Missam vero quae omnium est divinissimum non dubitant brevissimo tempore perficere nec ipsi ab hoc detestabili abusu abstinere nec Praetali eos corripere curant.

In what manner the Venerable Cardinal Bellarmine complains thereof, as related in the Bull, Year which, etc., N. S. S. Benedicti XIV. (in Bullar.

iom.: 3 pag. 92 et § 15.) - Aliud est praesumptum uberrimis lacrymis dignum, quod ob nonnullorum Sacerdotum incuriam aut impletamentem sacrosancta Mysteria tam indecere tractentur ut qui illa tractant videantur non credere Majestatem Domini esse praesentem. Thus indeed some without spirit, without effect, without fear, with incredible haste profane the sacred, which would have Christ the Lord not be seen, or themselves not be seen as being from Him: Merati however says on page 788 note 3, besides the Rubrics of the Missal, considered as a proximate rule: Sacrorum Rituum, there is presumed Decreta 8 to be present. C. Rituum, quae censeri debent pariter ut regula proxima, cum haed S. C. habeat facultatem declarandi omnia dubia, quae circa Ritus insurgunt; prodit colligitur ex Constitutione 74. Xisti.. V. etideo suas Resolutiones habentur tamquam Pontificis Oracula: Notat vero non omnes suas Declarationes dici Decreta rigorose sumpta, 286 Lib VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist. But only those things which emanate in the strict form of a Decree, or at least have some clause of a Decree at their end, such as: is observed by all: commanded to be observed by all, etc. If however they are merely Declarations of Doubts, then according to the opinion of some, they are considered only directly addressed, for they are regarded as the Responses of most wise men. But says Ursaja that resolutions of this kind should be preferred to the opinions of other Doctors. Up to now Merati.

The same opinion holds Eusebius. Amort to three of sacrifice. In the following, however, question 10 asks what is to be done if there exists in some diocese or religious order a custom contrary to the rubrics? And thus it responds: The Sacred Congregation of Rites constantly tolerates a custom, at least immemorially contrary to the Rubrics. Conscientia igitur licet se conformare consuetudini Diocesanae, praesertim in rebus levioris momenti, qua non cedunt ad deformem cultum publici.

This is drawn from several decrees of the Sacred Congregation at Merat, in which it is said that customs should not be rejected unless they contain positive indecency that cannot be decently tolerated. The Rubrica prescribes that the celebrant should be shod. Hoc tamen sufficit, ut sit indutus crepidis, vulgo dictis piavele seu panofola, ut recte ait Croix n. 399, et communius usus habet. It is common, however, that to celebrate Mass barefoot out of contempt, without cause, does not exceed the bounds of a venial sin, according to section 82, chapter 3. Croix l.c., Lugo d. 20 n. 102 et aut rationabili causa dicunt Croix ibidem cum et ll. cc. nullum esse peccatum. It is said by Croix n. 402, that one who could not celebrate without a staff might licitly use such a staff.

He adds in the same place. Gobat. quod, si quis nec quiete ret celebrare nisi utroque brachio super altari inclinato, licite sic celebraret privatim, non autem publice Cap. II. Bubble. V. euchar., ut est sacrificium; 287 28; nisi hoc faceret ex necessitate; hoc tamen puto non excedere veniale, à quo videtur excusari posse, qui ob infirmitatem nequiret rectus stare et ex suo devotione voluerit celebrare modo populi admiratio vitetur. They say in presumptuous Croix n. 427, and in P. Condina p. 5io n. 4, that if someone cannot elevate the Host, but can perform the rest, he may celebrate privately; and presumptuously publicly, if necessity be present, and the people are warned: but I think it sufficient to warn only the people, if anyone celebrates out of devotion. "Whereby it will be venial only."

To omit the usual prayers, while the Priest is dressing himself, in order to avoid... and ..., etc., the washing of the hands either before or after Mass, although it should easily be omitted, does not seem to present sufficient matter for rigorously binding precept, they hold § 6. » 2. To omit the Gloria, or the Credo, or any name of a saint in the Canon, or those things which are interposed at the time of Pascha between the Communicants, or after the action. Diana p. 2 t. 14 R. 49, et 89. c. res. 4. negat esse peccatum, et quod rubrica sit tantum directiva. Si quis autem in Missa advertat aliquid à se omissum, regulariter non esse repetendum, ait de exped.

Offering 1. 2 c. 5. He regularly says this because: 1. if it concerns the substance, for example something pertaining to consecration, certainly I should repeat it. 2. if while secretly praying he afterwards notices after a few words that he has omitted something notable, for instance on Pascha when the communicants are somewhat grieved and need to be repeated and redone, he considers this. c. thus in Hanc igitur, proper, if anything has been omitted, whether it is Gospel or Epistle, if one thing was said instead of another: 7 Regarding the omission of parts of Mass, it is necessary to distinguish between ordinary parts and extraordinary parts. The ordinary parts are those which are always said or performed; and to omit these from oneself is a mortal sin, unless the levity of matter excuses it. Hence when the PP. firmly say that it is a mortal sin to omit Confession with others at the beginning of Mass, namely the Epistle, Gospel, principal Collects, Offertory, Breaking of the Host, and that mixture in the Blood. Ita. Sectione 83, caput 3.

Tourney t. 5 p. 421. Sporer from no. 43. Mazzotta t. 3 p. 209. Roncaglia c. 3 q. 4. . 5 art. 7. licet non omnia haec reperias apud omnes hos AA. The same should be said with Tournely 1. c. concerning the omission of Preface: In Canonic, however, it is mortal to omit any prayer, or to change its words so that the sense varies, or to omit some word which, when

removed, does not make the remaining words signify; Concina 1. c. and Croix n. 419 with Diana, Fill., although Croix n. 420 calls it too rigid, but unjustly.

The same is said with and as per Tournely, loc. cit. The same must be said if anyone were to omit ten or eight names of saints, as they consider it more accurate: and Diana part. iotr. 16 R. 36 (contrary to Bernal and those who hold that it is presumptuous to omit the name of one or another saint, but rightly and commonly deny this Roncaglia cap. 3 qu. 4 c. Crex n. 419 cum Fill. Aversa, et Diana, 283. Sporer num. 425. Renzi, loc. cit., with Suar and Tournely, and Roncag., excuse a grave fault by omitting three or four names of Saints.

However, venial is it to omit Kyrie eleison, as Rone says in his fourth chapter, section four, chapter three. Dub. V. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 289 tract: 15 n. 75. and . 280. They say the same thing, Mazzotta, p. 209.

Lugo distinguishes in the twentieth distinction, number one hundred four, and concerning the Gospel according to Saint John, against Roncaglia's question four of the first part, who says not improbably that with . It is venial to omit one or another cross on the offerings, or the compression of the chest, or the hand-washing, III: and Diana part. 3 tract. 5 R. 45. The same is said by Croix n. 147. with the fourth [question], concerning the omission of the Psalm Judica, the sign of the Cross above the water, the washing of the fingers in the Mass, and similar matters. A venial presumption is considered to be omitting one of the three principal Collects, as commonly stated by Tournely p. 411. . 283., and Croix n. 412. cum Quarti; but he thinks that it is not a presumptuous mortal sin to omit two of these Prayers: yet others more correctly contradict him, as Concina l. cit. and those who add that if the first prayer be omitted, then the secret must be recited, not afterwards. De Collecta propria ita est: nam alias orationes quae praeter eam adduntur in Missa non erit mortale omittere, ut cc. Si autem in Missali verba Canonis sint detrita et non possit aliud Missale haberi nisi post longum tempus illa omittere cum memoria non tenentur nullum est peccatum Mazzola p. 210. et Croix n. 479. Cum tamen mutilare verba aut syncope intermedia salvo sensu et seculo scandalo non sit plus quam veniale Croix n. 442. cum qui pababiliter addit nullum esse peccatum si id ex naturali defectu fiat.

The priest would indeed sin, if in the purification of the chalice, solely water were used, 408. From part 5. concerning the Chalice. Omission. Where it is said: The Priest always ought to pour wine over the Chalice after he has received the whole Sacrament of the Eucharist. But this will

not be more than a venial sin, as commonly stated in lib. 290, cap. 300. VI.

Treatise. III. On the Eucharist, they say Concina, p. 510 n. 3. Pasq. qu. 269 n. 8. et Groix n. 423. procem. p. 6. nullum esse peccatum, solam aquam adhibere; sed melius dicunt Concina loco citato ac Bona; Amic. Cosetti, et Armand. according to whom it would not be excused from a venial sin if water were used without a pontifical dispensation; yet it would be excused, as they say, if there were a reasonable cause for which I think that the absence of any abstemious person, or the wine being red, suffices in order to avoid an indecent defilement.

Here incidentally it should be noted, that it is more decent for blood to be taken with a single draught, as commonly taught; but Bauld permit this. Gabrinus allows that a cup may be brought to the mouth for the second and third time, so that the remaining blood may be consumed; but Tournell say better this. Castald. et Crassus ibidem, semel calicem ori ad movendum, aliquantulum immorando ut reliquiae omnes (quantum fieri potest) attrahantur. Moreover, St. Pius V. wrote in a certain Epistle found at letter 10. That in the cup may be poured the same quantity of wine as there were species of blood, and that it may be taken through the same vessel by which the blood was consumed.

These things have been thus far concerning ordinary parts: but as for extraordinary parts, namely those which are not said in every Mass, to omit them is not a mortal sin unless so many parts are omitted that they would constitute notable matter; thus carefully all together, unless so many parts are omitted that they would constitute notable matter, as the Concina has adverted to at p. 510 n. 3 and Et wingaudt in tract. 15 n: 75. whatever the Fourth may say, and see what is said at n. 400. Veniale tamen erit omittere Gloria, aut Credo, sequentia, collectas (praeter proprias Missae), tractum, Praefationem, vel Communicantes, aut Hanc igitur, specialia. Thus commonly Concina, and Wigandt II: cc. 11 n. 11. Roncag. qu. 4 R. 2. . 284. cum Hanno, et Croix n. 420. cum Lugo, Diana, et Filliuc, Cap. III. Dub.

V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 391洗手前应在弥撒开始前至少进行轻微的净手，如果双手因对圣祭的敬畏而极为肮脏，则应进行严重净手，正如他们正确所说。1 R. 2 和 Quarti 及其他人所言。 To omit the lotion after the Mass, there will be no sin, as rightly says Croix n. 413 with Quarti and others. Dubitatur i. Whether a Regular who mortally sins by naming himself in the fourth place instead of the General in the place of the Bishop will be guilty?

They affirm. Article 7, note 2: Renzi against chapter 4, question 16 and response 50 from a certain declaration. The Sacred Congregation says otherwise. But they deny it: however, according to the general usage (at least among us), and in accordance with common opinion, Merati holds at page 437 and Gavant in the chapter from the Declaration. S. C. And it is clearly proven from the Rubrica p. 2 tit. 8 n. 2, where it is stated that, if the Bishop has died in office, the name of Bishop should be omitted. Doubt is cast 2. Whether it is a venial sin to omit the Prayers before or after Mass?

They affirm with Fag. and Leand., although speaking of those things which are assigned after Mass. But commonly: they deny 2. . 267 and Ronca. qu. 1 R. 2, because in the Rubric there is no precept concerning them, but merely an indication; for there it is said only that prayers are to be recited for the convenience of the time (that is, opportunity) in the preparation for Mass. On this matter Gavant says: Hence it is evident that there is no sin if he who is to celebrate them omits them; and more commonly... they are omitted by the Priests. Nevertheless, this notwithstanding, the priest who, without any other preparation, at least having made it at home before coming to offer, I think ought not to be excused from some guilt. Doubt is cast.

Whether it is a sin to omit prayers by putting on clothes? They deny it at the beginning of chapter eighty-two, and Burchard also. On the contrary, they [10 c. 29 qu., 5 and Sylvest. apud] hold that this is a mortal sin, because, as they say (but not sufficiently probatively), it is fitting to celebrate mortally without clothes, just as without prayers for clothes. Therefore it must be held with the common opinion, that this omission is culpable, but no more than venial, as Lugo thinks in dist. 20 n. 106. 8, with Henry and Pighius, and as Dubitatur 4. thinks. Whether a Priest sins if he does not recite at the Solemn Mass what is chanted by the Choir?

They deny it in Wigand tract. 15 n. 75. Diana p. 1 tract. 14 R. 42. item 511. ac. Pelix. They say that it suffices for the Priest to attend to what is sung; for what is said from either side communicates with each other, as happens in the Canonical Hours. Others however according to Concina p. 510 n. 3. and Pasq ap. et tit. 5. n. 4 and 5.

Others finally, as Lugo says in chapter 20, number 107, and Aversa, question 1, section 12, not improbably say that he is to be held only under a venial sin. Reason, because then indeed the Epistle or Gospel is not omitted from the Mass, since they are already sung solemnly by the

Ministers for the instruction of the people, for whom they were instituted to be read or sung; whence that reading seems more fittingly prescribed privately for the priest himself than for the people: Therefore, the same matter can become grave in itself and light if it is not read by the priest but only by the Ministers, since in celebrating that Mass both the priest and the ministers perform one action. Dub. 5. Whether it is a mortal sin to celebrate Mass with notable voluntary distraction? They deny Croix n. 443. with Diana, and Barbi, and Mazzotta considers it probable t. 3 p. 212.

And this, even if the distraction were under the act of consecration. Cap. III. Dub. V. Regarding the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 295 through participation or reception; because (as they say) an internal attention in Prayer is not prescribed under a grave burden according to the opinion of many Doctors related in book 4 number 177. They affirm however, Concina p. 513 n. 13.

Roncaglia cap. 3 qnæst. 2 R. 3. et consentit quod ea, quae recitantur in Canone, et signanter sub consecratione, et communione. To this opinion rather I adhere: reason, because (given the premise of the question, whether internal attention is directed towards the essence of the Prayer about which we have sufficiently spoken in note 177). The sacrifice, besides the reason of prayer, has also the reason of the most excellent cult of Religion; it seems an irreverence to impose such upon it; who, while professing that he acts religiously in worshipping God, voluntarily distracts himself. « 3. From devotion even a little something. Mass, presumptuously while secretly praying, to add, for example. Prayer, Dominican, or some Psalm; or in the Canon by the names of Saints the name of the Patron of the place, is expedient.

» Sacrifice c. 5. I have said lightly: because notably adding is to will a mortal sin; cf. ex. » Question Noneult. It is certain among all, that to add something mortal in the Mass is to introduce a new Rite with one's mind. See § 83, sect. 1, and others, frequently throughout.

Hence rightly P. Concil: p. 510 n. 5 dicit, eum peccaregraviter, qui adderet in Missa novas publicas preces. If, however, out of importunate devotion, more collects are added from the same Missal, or from Credo, or Gloria, Pater, Ave, or something similar, this does not exceed venial fault; thus commonly Concilium 1. c. Sporer n. 428. n. 1 says: "He sins vitiarily who adds the Gloria and Credo in the Mass for the Dead, because this seems to be a sufficiently grave disorder." They probably say, Num. 5. Concina et n. 429 Croix, cum Pasqual., that although it is better to observe the Rubric, nevertheless it is not forbidden for any reason or from devotion to add one Collect; and Gobat and Pasqara add in ibid., Lib. 294, that this can be

presumed possible. VI. Trace.

III. On the Eucharist. At the feast of the second class, if there is a particular cause for the collection, another can be added at will for public necessity, or for the third and fourth collections; Croix loc. cit., the more common opinion being that it should be omitted in the feasts of the first and second [class]. Classis. Here it is to be noted from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation that, since from is the SS. The sacrament, even in a double Mass, may be commemorated thereof; yet then the Preface must be common or proper to that Mass alone, as is also stated in other decrees of the same Sacred Congregation in Missae aut in Missae votivis pro re gravi et causa publica semper dicitur Gloria. Croix n. 464.

And in Solemn Mass for a grave cause or public reason, such as forty hours, it is said a presumptuous Credo; Croix n. 466. In the Ancestral Prayer it is not forbidden to name any canonized saint, and even two, but not more than two; Croix n. 462. It is forbidden to add anything to Confession, and all the more to the name of any Saint, as Tambi rightly notes in c. 5 § 3 n. g. And thus it is forbidden to add the name of other saints in public litanies before the people, according to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation on 22nd March 1671 at Litanies n. 5. 412 « 4. To celebrate before said Matins, as against : Vasq. ...of whom many nevertheless, when asked by Palao, say that it is a venial sin if it be done without cause: let this and that also call in question the article 7 § 1 de exped. sacrif. in dubium vocet. * (On this question whether it is permissible to celebrate before the said matutinum and laudes?

See the aforementioned n. 347. 5. Which are prescribed to be spoken aloud in such a manner that they may be heard submissively by those who stand: Sacrific. lib. 2 c. 9 whatever he says Navar. apud Sa v. Mass. But the same thing is noted by de Lugo, in his second section on matters of fear, without any scruple being raised regarding it verbally.

Before all, this must be noted, which is found in the Rubrica partis 1, titulus 16, where it is said: But the priest above all should take care that what is clearly spoken may not be misunderstood. Cap. III. Dub. V. Regarding the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, let it be brought forth both tinged and placed properly, neither too hastily so that those who read may notice what is written; nor too slowly (those who prolong an inappropriate devotion in Mass should take note), lest the hearers be wearied: nor with a voice too loudly (and many err in this), lest others be disturbed, which perhaps are being celebrated at the same Church then; neither too softly, so that it cannot be heard by those present, but moderately and gravely, which both moves devotion and is suitable for those who hear, so that

what is read may be understood, and what should be said in secret, he pronounces with a voice low enough to hear himself, yet not loud enough for those around to hear. It is doubted i.

Committet peccatum, qui ita submissè pronunciaverit verba, ut ne seipsum quidem audire possit? Ex hoc sufficit, ut exterius proferantur. Others, however, as Croix n. 438. 16 lit. g. . 3 n. 6. . l. 4 c. 7 n. 6. and others say, that this person commits a mortal sin, because the words which are not heard do not constitute a vocal prayer. They say, that this person commits a mortal sin, because the words which are not heard do not constitute a vocal prayer. However, Tournely probably considers it, p. 842. But this is not mortal sin, since it is sufficiently probable that the opinion expressed (namely, that external prayer does not require that the one praying hear himself), which they hold. Sylvius; and others whom we have adduced in l 4 n.163. with Tourn. loc. cit., who assert this to be common; and this is done by that which is found in the book of Kings, chapter 1, where it is said: Anna... prayed to the Lord... saying, Lord, etc. The prayer says, He has not sinned, because, for a prayer to be vocal, it suffices that it be uttered externally; then it is added: Moreover, Anna was speaking in her heart, and only her lips were moving, and no voice at all was heard.

But rightly 1, a mortal is not excused for uttering the words of Consecration in such a manner. Reason, because, as the aforementioned opinion of Palai and others, as stated above, is presumptuously probable, the Sacrament was exposed to the danger of nullity through its exposition, which certainly is illicit according to 415 Dubitatur 2. It is a sin to recite submissively what is commanded to be recited with a loud voice? It seems altogether to deny the converse. In response to point 3, they say that it is mortal. But I prefer to say with Tourn. 1. c., that it is not mortal, since it does not appear to have serious matter; but it can least of all be excused by vernal, since the opposite is expressly prescribed in the rubric.

They say however Mazzotta in t. 3 p. 211 and Wigandt in tract. 15 n. 76, that one does not sin who recites submissively but loudly what is to be said secretly, if it exceeds the measure of secret recitation; But this does not satisfy me, for according to the Rubric it is not always sufficient to exceed the measure of secret prayer; besides those things which are to be said submissively in the Mass, others are to be recited aloud, and some with a moderate voice, and all these should be recited so loudly that they can be heard by those present; although P. considers it no longer necessary for the whole people to hear the voice, but sufficient that those who are attentive and near enough to perceive what is read, may do so. 416 Doubt 3. Whether it is a mortal sin to recite aloud what should be said in a low voice! Commonly do the Doctors say that there is no sin if the words are

heard by the sole Ministers; thus says P. and Croix n. 440. with Gob. On the contrary, Gav. 1, c., and Quarti, p. 1, tit. 16, doubt whether he commits a mortal sin who reads aloud the entire Canon, or, as Quarti adds, a notable part of it, or other prayers which should be recited humbly. Reason (as they say), firstly because these Holy Words would grow contemptible through frequent hearing; secondly because by thus uttering these words the Priest would seem to wish to introduce a new rite, whence scandal could easily arise from this neglect.

And Croix agrees with regard to the words of Consecration, because the People (as he says), knowing those words subsequently, would thereafter speak rashly and jest about them, Chapter III. Dub. V. From the Immaculate Conception, as it is a Sacrifice. 297 how it would be used; then he asserts that the common opinion holds it to be venial if the aforementioned words of Consecration are heard only up to 6 or 8 paces; mortal however, -if up to 40. But he himself considers it to be presumptuous mortal sin if within such a space, a great part of the people is present; which nevertheless the Sacred Council does not dare to approve: I will speak about this and say what my opinion is: There can be no doubt that what is offered in the Mass, which should be said humbly, cannot be excused as venial when it is against the Rubric, as above it is prescribed, namely, that the Priest should hear himself and not be heard by those present.

Furthermore, I would easily assent to the possibility that one could commit a mortal sin by pronouncing the words of Consecration or Canon in such a manner as to be audible at forty paces; for then he should raise his voice with all effort so that it might be heard at about three hundred palms, and this would seem a grave scandal indeed; truly someone wise would show contempt for words and ritual. But who, except one seized by mind, would do this? However, beyond this case, I cannot recognize in this a grave sin, since the reasons adduced are insufficient to convince: for I do not see how such a great scandal could arise from this, especially if the Celebrant pronounces the words devoutly; nor will I be moved by it, because those words would not become vile, or listeners use them rashly, for if that were the case, the Gospel of St. John, which is called quotidia, to prevent its becoming vile, should have been secretly spoken: «6. To change the Mass, and on a feast day or a Sunday 417 double, e.g., on those days on which it is prohibited to be celebrated on a double feast, e.g., during octaves, Epiphany, Paschaltide, etc., Feria IV. Ash Wednesday, during the greater week, on the Vigil of the Nativity of the Lord, without grave cause he who has received stipend for the Sacred Service is bound to say Mass either for the dead, or votive, or in this, or in that altar, according as money offering is made (provided only that the rubrics permit, by neglect of which, the

order of the Church would be reversed, for devotion of another, does not suit). Or for the dead, or from another Saint in the number of Saints related. Escob against s. 4 thinks it permissible to say votive Mass during Holy Week; but this is refuted. I have said so.

Without a grave cause: such is considered, i. Which pertains to the good of the Republic or of the Prince, for example, the necessity of rain, the outbreak of war, or some similar universal evil: (Thus presumptuously c. 6§ + n. 4.)* Item a solemn act of thanksgiving, a solemn exposition of the Eucharist, for example, on the Forefeast days.*(See what should be said about this n. 421. infra n. III.)* 2. When a corpse is present in the Church where its use has been established. 3. If anyone celebrates in the church where a festive day of the proper place is being observed: for this reason he not only can, but by congruity ought to conform himself thereto as regards the location, notes Gavant. See who § 2 et 4 addit, etiamsi Sacerdos accepto stipendio homini promiserit qui stipendium pro Sacro accepit, tenetur dicere Missam pro defunctis, vel votivam, vel in hoc aut isto altari prout pecuniam offerens petivit (quantum tamen rubricae permittunt, quibus neglectis Ecclesiæ ordinem invertere, ob alterius devotionem, non convenit). vel pro defunctis. praesumptum in altari privilegiato, non solùm posse, sed debeo celebrare Missam curr(ent)tem diebus, quibus istae prohibentur. * (Hoc intelligendum, quando Missa pro illa die promissa est.

"However, it is certain today, after the receipt of decree number 33g. v." Question 1. Whether indulgences of a privileged altar are rightly granted when Mass is said on two consecutive days currently permitted. This also must be noted, namely that since many votive Masses have been accepted although the days are not non-impeded and not sufficient, they may be applied to current Masses, as S.C. declared on May 19, 1614, ex gratia speciali Pontificis apud Merati p. 116).* Nevertheless, even though God by vow has promised such Masses, it is not nevertheless bound by these days, because the vow does not obligate when a greater good, which he compares to the Confruentiatem Officii with the Mass, can be served on other days. I said 2. in the number of Saints related: because if he is only beatified, concerning whom to certain Priests, for example, from what Order he was, it has been granted Mass to be read, it teaches Gran. 2. 2. cont. 1 c. 7 d. 4 s. 2. and Escob. contra Palaim, that no other Priests may read: because thus the Sacred Congregation of Rites determined expressly. According to Gavant. Vid.

1. c. cap. 6, ubi Palaim sequens dicit, contrarium esse probabilius ac magis pium: imò de Sanctis Societatis certum esse, si celebrent in templis ejus; Cap. III. Dub. V. Of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 299 • from the Society

by the concession of the Pontiffs. The same holds • Quint. tom. 7. sing. 1. c. » 7.

If anyone violates the rubric intended for the essence, or quasi essence, of the Mass, or if he plainly neglects to observe it, he sins mortally. Escob. ex 1 lib. 3 cap. 21 n. 9. This discourse on the Masses among votive Masses for a grave cause and public reason is always said with Gloria, namely when it may be said 4th. From the rubric title 4 number 3. For which causes may Masses be said as votive Masses on those days? They are forbidden on Sundays and on all double feasts.

Likewise during the Octaves of Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, Ash Wednesday, in the Greater Week, and in the Vigils of the Nativity of the Lord and of Pentecost, it is forbidden ex decreto. Sacrosanctae Congregationis Rituum 28 augusti 1627. ap. Item infra Octavam Corporis Christi, ex Decreto ejusdem S. C. 21 jun. 1670. approbato à Clem. X. approved. Cross 1.6 p. 2 n. 498. item 2055.

Decretum 19. The same is to be said all the more of the Masses for the Dead, which moreover cannot be expressed in the exposition of the Saints. Sacramenti 40. Hours, and in the Church where they are celebrated on a double feast day, even if those feasts were prescribed to be celebrated according to the ordinance of the testators, as in Decree of May 7, 1746. Exceptis autem his diebus semper dicuntur missae ob quas causas dictis diebus possint dici votivae vel de requiem.

But it should be noted 1.419 what is stated in the rubric under title 4, number 3, where it says: For which causes Missae votivæ can be said on those days?... In private Masses, they can be said at the discretion of the priests on any day when the Office is not double or Sunday... And this should not happen frequently, unless for a reasonable cause and as far as possible, the Mass should coincide with the Office. Note that it should not be done without a reasonable cause; hence it is said in III:3 that it does not suffice for any cause to celebrate votive Masses promissory under stipend, unless there is a pressing occasion, or some similar slight reason, by which the priest might readily expedite himself. But undoubtedly, the petition made by Dante for alms from a Mass on those days on which votive Masses can be said will be a just cause for celebrating that Mass. Moreover, it is probably presumed that 2 c. 2 §. 1 n. 3 considers sufficient a special cause of devotion towards some Martyr or Saint; for this (he says), prudent men do without scruple. But R. 1 ex Gav. p. 1 tit. 4 lit. p. in fine puts forward that the aforementioned Rubric be 500 Lib.

VI. Tract. III. On the Eucharist: solely by counsel and in no way obligate, thus: so that even throughout frequently Missas De obligatione celebrandi Missas votivas promissas sub stipendio may be recited without any cause required; for otherwise, as he says, it would seem the rubric contradicts itself, since previously it had said Missas De obligatione celebrandi Missas votivas promissas sub stipendio may be celebrated freely at the discretion of Priests, but this discretion is not limited to a cause; yet I do not acquiesce to this opinion if anyone would wish frequently to recite Missas De obligatione celebrandi Missas votivas promissas sub stipendio without any cause. For the rubric by those words, that however frequently they may not be done, restricts discretion so that they cannot even be celebrated frequently unless a reasonable cause is present. It must be noted that the conventual masses must always be in agreement with the office of the day according to the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation on May 16, 1626, and January 16, 1627, as found among Merati in Aliacensis Canonici; there are no profitable distributions from the first text, fourth number three.

It is asked I. Whether it is a mortal sin to celebrate a votive Mass or one for Requiem on those days desired? They affirm what is commonly denied by the Council, secluded from scandal and contempt, Section 3, Chapter 83. Lugdunensis, decretum 20, numerus 105. Fillius de Roncaglia c. 4 q. 2.

Reply 2. Sporer n. 429 cum . Looking at, etc., and Escob. l. 21 n. 512 with Soto, Sylv. Henry Med. et Reg.

Reason, because it does not seem that there is a notable perversion of ritual in this. But Escob. considers this to be mortal sin even in solemn feasts (although opposed and indeed probable by the authority of certain Doctors); and he holds the same opinion. At least in public Mass, it would be difficult to excuse this from a grave scandal. Moreover, he says that it cannot be excused from a mortal sin to say Masses for the dead on forbidden days, because this is distinctly prohibited in the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of 5 August 1662, as found by Merati and approved; where it is said: Distinctly it is prescribed, that private Masses for the dead not be celebrated at all in duplicate... And let the rectors of churches take care that this kind of Decree be observed inviolably. However, all agree that Masses may be celebrated from obligation to celebrate votive Masses promissory under stipend, or de Re Cap. III. Dub.

V. From Eucharius, as it is a Sacrifice, on account of grave causes. What these are precisely, see in the subsequent inquiry. Why the second? What are the reasons why it can be said that on the 42nd day after death a Votive Mass is not celebrated on certain days, and on which days are

Votive Masses for the Dead prohibited?

Resp. What are the reasons why the 42nd day can be called the 418th day of Mass, on which days votive masses are prohibited, or on presumed days for the dead that are forbidden? If there should arise a public necessity, as was said above regarding Bussem. II. If in any Church a double Feast is celebrated, which easily can happen in Regular Churches, there the Priest should celebrate Mass conforming to the Feast, as correctly noted in tit. 10 n. 16 v.

Non tamen, et de hoc adest Decretum S. C. 10 Nov. 1622. apud Croix n. 2055 Decr. 263. It declared moreover the same Sacred Congregation on July 24, 1683, according to Merati and the custom, abuse contrary thereto. III. If a holy exposition is made. Sacraments in Prayer of forty hours.

In illud autem observandum est quod statuit Clemens XII. in Const. 9. Ibi Pontifex prescribit ut in altari ubi fit expositio Eucharistiae celebretur Missa votiva solemnis de SS. solemnis de SS. Sacrament with Gloria and Credo, as are celebrated Masses for a grave reason; excepting however Sundays and Feasts of the first and second class. Order, nor yet the fourth week-day. Ash Wednesday, and feasts 2, 3, and 4. In the major week, on the days infra Octaves of Easter, and Pentecost, on the Vigils of the Nativity of the Lord and Pentecost, and on the days of the Octave of the Epiphany; on these days he ordained that the common Mass be sung with the Prayer of Saints.

Sacramenti sub una conclusione; quam commemorationem voluit fieri etiam in Missis privatis. Fieri praesumptum est in Missis privatis; quae si celebrantur de SS. Sacraments on permitted days, there will be 418; on which days are Votive Masses prohibited? without Gloria; and Credo. IV. In the day of obituary, with the present corpse (even if it had not been used elsewhere, contra, as stated above), a Mass for Requiem can be said, even on Dominicains and double Feasts according to the Decree of S. C. May 23, 1603, among the Merits. Classis ex Decreto 5 Julii 1698 ibidem n. 525. Cum autem primùm habetur notitia de obitu alicujus procul defunctæ personæ, potest cantari Missa de diè obitus, praesumptum in Festo duplici, non tamen de præcepto; tunc enim differenda est ad sequentem diem, ex Decr. 4 Maji 1686 apud Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 2055 Decr. 82.

These Decrees are to be understood concerning Solemn Masses, and not private Masses, according to n. 505; on the contrary, what Wigandus says in tractate 5, n. 68. Decree however, which is brought forward in 1662 in addition to the aforementioned Decree of November 2, 1662. In the same

[Decree] it is said concerning the third, seventh, and fortieth days: but private Masses are to be said on these days, and not deferred. Item eadem S. C. Rit. 19 Junii 1700 in Quod si accidat anniversarium vel dies tertius septimusque et trigesimus in festo de præcepto debet transferri ad sequentem diem ex Decr. 23 Maji 1603. Then the anniversary may be presumed to be anticipated; and then it is said that the Mass is to be celebrated according to the manner of an anniversary, Decr. 5 Julii 1608.

In n. 529. It is asked III. An obligatus, ut dicat Missam Qui stipendium pro Sacro accepit, tenetur » dicere Missam pro defunctis, vel votivam, vel in hoc, aut isto altari, prout pecuniam offerens petit » vit (quantum tamen rubricae permittunt, quibus neglectis, Ecclesiæ ordinem invertere, ob alterius devotionem, non convenit). de B. Mary Virgin, or concerning Requiem, on account of alms-giving, or chaplaincy, on those days on which it is permitted to celebrate them, may she satisfy by celebrating a continuously flowing Mass? They deny 1. 2 c. 2 §. 2 n. 6, because the Priest is bound to fulfill a reasonable will in regard to the stipulated reward.

But they commonly affirm, and presumptuously hold Azor, p. 1 l. 10 c. Cap. III. Dub. V. Concerning the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice. 305 32 qu. 5. Henr. c. 4 n. 125 cum Sa, Garzia, et ideo Rubrica loquens de Missis apud In Missis autem votivis pro re gravi, et causa publica, semper dicitur Gloria., eas permittit, sed in fine subdit: Quoad fieri potest, Missa Officio conveniat.

They also say that this is valid, namely at the end, as it says: even though the priest has expressly promised a Mass; and even though (they add Croix n. 371 and the same), such a vow is not for a better good. However, it must nevertheless be admitted that if a Mass is to be said on a privileged altar, which on permitted days must necessarily be celebrated for a Requiem, as we have said in n. 339 v. You will ask 1. It is asked IV. What ought to be observed regarding the manner of celebrating 423 Masses that are obligatory? It is to be observed I.

What is to be noted regarding the manner of celebrating votive Masses for a grave reason and a public cause? Always in votive Masses it is said Gloria; hence it is not necessary to say prayers unequal in number, as Merati says, p. 135 n. 42. However, three prayers must be said in private Mass; but in solemn Mass only one is said, Merati n. 44 Advertendum II. Why should not Masses be said on those days for which votive Masses can be said? That is to say, for the feasts of the Nativity of the Lord, Epiphany, Pasch, Assumption of Blessed Mary, and all similar solemnities, as well as the feasts of the saints that have their own Introits and Collects, as Paul V

declared according to Merati, page 121, note 17. In other Masses however, apud In votive Missas pro re gravi et causa publica semper dicitur Gloria., in quibus veritas et ritus verborum non violatur, nihil prohibet, quin ipsæ dici possint, licet melius sit dicere Missam Qui stipendium pro Sacro accepit, tenetur dicere Missam pro defunctis vel votivam vel in hoc aut isto altari prout pecuniam offerens petit vit (quantum tamen rubricae permittunt, quibus neglectis Ecclesiæ ordinem invertere, ob alterius devotionem non convenit)., quae habetur in Missali: ita Merati ibidem qui pag. 122 cum Advertendum III. Concerning those days on which it is permissible to say Masses 418, on which days votive Masses are prohibited? For any saint, provided that his canonization is attested in the Martyrology or otherwise; see Merati p. 119 n. 15. ex Gav.

Whereby Masses granted to some Religious Order or place for Beati cannot be celebrated by other persons, churches, and days than those to which they are granted in the Diplomatics, contrary to 1. 21 n. 535, with Bisso, Guyeto, and common usage, according to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation issued on September 10, 1625, and elsewhere mentioned by Croix n. 2055. Decr. 227. IV. Admonendum est: id quod præscribitur rubrica circa Missas de obligatione celebrandi votivas promissas sub stipendio particulares; et r. In Missa (ibi) Pontifex prescribit ut in altari ubi fit expositio Eucharistiae celebretur Missa votiva solemnis de SS. de SS. Trinity, quando dicitur pro Gratiarum actione, cum prima Oratione dicitur alia Oratio tantùm, Deus cujus misericordiae, etc., sub una conclusione, hoc tamen procedit in Missa solemni pro re gravi; vel publica causa Ecclesiæ, non vero in privatis, in quibus secunda Oratio erit diei, et tertia de Gratiarum actione: ita Merati p. 125 n. 24. cum In Missa de Angelis dicitur semper Gloria, quacumque die celebretur, secunda Oratio erit diei, et tertia illa, quae alioquin esset secunda in Missa currente. If however a votive Mass is petitioned, thereupon the Pontiff prescribes that in the altar where the exposition of the Eucharist takes place, a solemn votive Mass of the SS. should be celebrated.

The Mass of the Dedication of Saint Michael the Archangel may be said on September 29th; and thus a presumed Mass of the Angels Custodians may be said on October 2nd, according to Merati. 3. In the Mass of the Holy Spirit, the second prayer will be on the day, the third to all, or Concede according to the variety of times, as Merati states on page 127, note 28, with the Fourth and Tournament. And thus presumptuously they are said to be Missae de SS. Sacramento (Merati ibid. n. 29). Missa de Passione, et de Apostolis. 4. in Missa de B. Mary Virgin, the second prayer will be on the day, the third on the Spirit S, and in the ferials the second on the Spirit S, the third on the Church or for the Pope.

Here it must be noted that in the place where the exposition of the Eucharist takes place, the Pontiff is prescribed to celebrate a solemn votive Mass of the SS. and of B. on the altar. Mary may be celebrated with Gloria and Creed for a public cause on account of the concourse of the people, according to the decree. S. C. 8. June Cap. III. Dub. V.

Of the Eucharist, as it is the Sacrifice. 565 1658:ap. Wed., p. 1, l. 7: Item notandum, quod si dicas Missam quod stipendium pro Sacro accepit, tenetur dicere Missam pro defunctis vel votivam vel in hoc aut isto altari prout pecuniam offerens petit vit (quantum tamen rubricae permittunt, quibus neglectis Ecclesiæ ordinem invertere, ob alterius devotionem, non convenit). de B. Virgin in the Feast of some saint semi-duplicated below some Octave B. If a Virgin is not to be named, then let not a votive and solemn Mass of the Communion of Saints be celebrated at that altar where the exposition of the Eucharist takes place, as the Pontiff prescribes. V. sed de ejus Octava, sine Gloria tamen et Credo, ex Decr. apud Crocium lib. 6 p. 2 num. 503 et al.

Si autem petitur Missa de SS Rosario, vel de Monte Carmelo, non potest dici Missa concessa Dominicanis, vel Carmelitis, ex Decretis ap. Wed. 5. In the Mass for the Dead, the Psalm Judica is not said; when celebrating with the beginning of the Introit, he does not sign himself with a cross but with a book; he does not say, "Jube Domine benedicere"; after the Epistle he does not kiss the book; he does not bless the water, nor does he say Gloria Patri in the Psalm Lavabo; to Agnus Dei he does not say Miserere, but Dona eis requiem; no prayer is said for peace; this Mass is not for peace, and we do not bless the Lord; rather, "Requiescant in pace" is said, and no blessing is given. Here at the last place of work it is a reward to note some Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites that are of greater moment concerning the celebration of Mass, excerpted from many sources, which Croix 1:6 p.2 n. 2055 affords. The conventual Mass should be celebrated daily in collegiate churches, whose clergy are numerous and have substantial revenues. January 14, 1603. 2. Canonici are absolutely bound to chant Mass on a day, that they may gain distributions. January 28. 1612. 3.

Priest who celebrates the conventual Mass in which the choir is bound to chant the Symbol, cannot perform that at the time when the said Symbol is chanted by the choir on 17 December 1695. Masses, ad satisfaciendum eleemosynis alicui Ecclesiase traditis, non sunt celebrandae per exteros, ubi commodae potest iis satisfieri per Sacerdotes ejusdem Ecclesiase. 28 Jan. 1606. 5. inferiorem episcopum non debent sumere de altari paramenta pro missa. This, however, is to be understood, as Gavant notes, so that the paraments are not placed in . Supplied by the Bishop himself

should not take from the altar vestments for Mass. 7 Jul. 1712.

Hoc tamen intelligendum, ut advertit Gavant. ne ponantur paramenta in . VI. Treatise. III. Concerning the Eucharist, according to the custom of the Bishops; for if they place it in a corner, that is changed by the very Rubrica p. 2 tit. 12 n. 6. where it says: If however (the Priest) is about to leave the paraments at the altar where he celebrated, after the completion of the Gospel... there he undresses himself.

Saltern ait Croix n. 2072. hoc permittem dum ubi non est commoditas alibi deponendi..... 6. A portable wooden altar with a stone altar is permitted to be used, notwithstanding the synodal constitution, provided it has its usual reliquary repository, January 19, 1614. Only the Bishop is permitted to have windows in the Church through which a prospectus of it may be had. I January 1614. 8. It is not permitted in churches in which the Holy Sacrament is not reserved. Sacramentum, celebratio Missae in Coena Domini; nec ejus asservatio in Sepulchro.

It is not permitted to celebrate Mass at the greater altar, while it is said in the Choir during the Matins, and... 10. It is permissible to make commemoration of the SS. Sacramentum, si ex sit, praesumptum in Missa de feste duplici, quod non sit unus vel duo. Class. 2 Dec. 1684. 11. If on the day of the commemoration of all the departed a Sunday occurs... the Office with the Mass for the dead shall be transferred to the following day, which is a presumed feast day prevented by a double festival. 10 October 1688. 12.

The priest uses a linen girdle more fittingly in the Sacrifice of the Mass than a silk one. Holding an indult from the Apostolic See to erect a private chapel in one's own home, if anyone wishes to build a wooden altar there, he does not need apostolic faculty, provided that the wooden altar is enclosed with sacred stone walls and can be moved, and does not display the image of a portable altar; it seems that by being thus enclosed, it should be understood that the altar adheres to the wall, and no space intervenes between it and the wall; for in this way it is verified that the altar does not display the image of a portable altar, and this has at least been so interpreted in its use. Chapter III. Dub. V.

Of Eachar., as it is the Sacrifice. 367 14. The celebration of Mass in an oratory built by a layperson cannot be prohibited before the Parish Mass is celebrated on March 31, 162g (according to Merati) 15. The Sacred Congregation has often deemed it fitting, in its Synodal constitutions, that on feast days Masses should not be celebrated in other churches, but rather

that they be observed, so that the Mass in the Parish Church may be celebrated at an opportune hour. May 25, 1652 (according to Bened). XIV.) De rigore juris non posse prohibere (scilicet Parochum), ut Missæ non celebrentur ante Missam à Parocho non celebratam. 27. June 1641. (apud idem.

Bon. l. c.). Herein at the last he casually adds something concerning the use of the exposition of the Eucharist, which the most learned Christian Lupus has long since proved to have been approved in the Church; and he greatly promotes it himself, saying that through frequent exposition of this kind of Sacrament, the people are drawn away from vain entertainments, the concourse of Churches is increased, and the faithful are more excited to devotion. However, St. Charles Borromeo in his Eleventh Synod. This diocesan prescription: Let no cause for the Eucharist be publicly proposed at random, but only gravely and publicly; whereas on other causes prayer may be instituted by others, but not the Sacrament apart from exposition. Item Benedictus XIV. (in sua) refert, S. C. Concilii die 17 Aug. 1630 in una Neapolitana sic præscriptisse: S. C. censuit, non licare Regulartibus etiam in eorum propriis Ecclesiis SS. The Sacred Eucharistic Sacrament to be publicly exposed for adoration, except on public causes which shall have been approved by the Ordinary; private causes may suffice, provided that the SS permit it.

The sacrament is not taken from the tabernacle, and if it is veiled, so that the sacred host itself cannot be seen. That was confirmed by our Father Ben. XIV per alium Decretum datum 16 Aprilis 1746 (Vide in ejus), ubi dicitur: Non licere exposi- tur publicè divinam Eucharistiam nisi causa publica et Episcopi facultas intervenerit. From all these Decretals it seems certain that it is not permitted to expose the Sacrament of the Altar publicly. Sacramentum ob litis victoriam, ob valetudinem alicujus (nisi sit persona publica; cujus salus communitatis bono sit expediens); et sic pro aliis privatis causis.

Numquam tamen hoc liceret propter specialiam devotionem aliqui particulares? P. Concina doubts. I shall say, what I feel. I say that if anyone seeks to procure this exposition for private use in order to promote public devotion, then it should rather appear a matter of public than private concern. I say with Concini: in this regard, it is to be considered whether in those places where exposition takes place, devotion and worship of the Sacrament are more increased or diminished; and according to this rule I judge that exposition should either be made or omitted; for where devotion and worship flourish, there is always obtained due Ordinarius permission; indeed, especially according to the frequent practice of our Religions at present, why should not such things rather be

praised than condemned.

Expositione Sacramenti; modo (exciperem) non sit nimis frequens, nam etiam frequens frequentia reverentiam erga tantum Sacramentum minueret. Moreover, it must be noted that with regard to secular churches there is an excessive presumption in the Decret. The Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars prohibits the extraction of the pyx from the tabernacle when it is exposed for private reasons, saying these words: If ever it should seem expedient to expose the sacred Host for private causes, the pyx shall never be taken out from the tabernacle, but rather, as if in an open receptacle of the same tabernacle, with the assistance of some Priest, vested in stole and chasuble; and with at least six lamps arranged around it. That same thing we command to be observed in secular churches. The 9th day of December 1602 in such a manner at the 30th number 27.

Benedictus autem XIV. in sua Bulla, Cum ut recti nostri (in Bullar. tom. IV. p. 317 § XIII.), making mention of the aforementioned Decrees, says that for a private cause a pyxis can never be drawn forth, nor an assumed blessing given to the people: But if (his very words are) it does not owe to be taken from the tabernacle, it is easily understood that in designated cases that thing should not be brought to the door of the Church, nor with it should blessing be imparted. Here however incidentally to Chapter H. Dub. V.

Regarding the Eucharist as it is a sacred rite. 50 I will state what the same Pontiff declares in the aforementioned Bull (therein § XIII): For it is not fitting that anyone should assume private authority to introduce a new ritual. He brings forth thereupon this Canon 13. Tridentiis, sessio 7, qua prohibuit mutare consuetos ritus circa administrationem Sacramentorum, et declarat, eum Canonem praesumptum esse quoad cultum SS. Eucharistiae. Speaking however about rites already introduced somewhere, he says thus:

And whenever it happens that one is induced to adopt such a rite, it is filled with nothing but an opposed emptiness. The Apostolic See did not hesitate to interdict him on that day, having been deprived of certain circumstances without any previous foresight or neglect by those who introduced the brief rite. Notandum praesumptum, quod ex Decreto Innocentii XII. r Septembr. 1730 (relato apud Merati pag. 581.) prohibeantur apponi statuae, reliquiae Sanctorum, ac imagines animarum Purgatorii in altari, in quo fit expositio. As regards that however; Bread, from the oven etc., Alleluia is not to be added, according to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation as found in Merati, i.e., in the Index of Decrees 523. At this last place: The prize of labor is to seek and see what may be

kept in churches as the Sacrament of the Eucharist?

The Cardinal Peter teaches in his Commentaries, t. 3, ad Caput Certum: it is certain that the Sacrament of the Eucharist can be reserved only in Parish Churches, because Apostolic Dispensations can be granted only in this regard; not however for Diocesan Churches: the reservation is presumed in Cathedrals, since they are detached from Parishes; yet it should not be reserved on the High Altar there, but in another chapel, on account of the Pontifical functions necessarily performed: and so back again to the High Altar by the Bishop. It is permitted to presume the Sacrament to be reserved in monastic churches, on account of the necessity of administering Communion there to the infirm, as they say in tract 3, chapter 6, note 1 and 6. Petra loc. cit. n. 18. cum Glossa in c. Permittimus de sentent. excomm. verbo Excommunicatis. The same is permitted in churches of living nuns in cloister, as decreed by the Sacred Congregation of the Council in Lisbon in the year 1585, which the same Sacred Congregation allowed on May 15, 1700, to the Fathers of the Oratory, an indult to presume the reservation of the Eucharist within the cloisters for a period of four years, during which the Exercises are undertaken by the Ordinands. Non permittitur autem in Collegiis solius Ordinarii auctoritate constitutis, ut sunt Conservatoria, qua non approbantur, sed tantum a Sede Apostolica to- Jerantur, et in quibus jura Parochialia praeservantur Parocho, ut decrevit S. C. Concilii in Salernitana 1702 Augusti 19 et in Neapolitana 1707 Julii 4: ubi spe- ciaber declaratum fuit, asservationem Eucharistiae non licere Conservatoris absque Apostolica auctori- tate; vide Petram n. 21.

The same [decree] was issued by the Sacred Congregation regarding the Regulars of Greece; therein article 23. The same applies to collegiate churches, unless the preservation of the Eucharist be for the service of their parishes, n. 24. The same regarding Churches of confraternities, and hospitals, n. 30. The same as Rural Churches, or others within the boundaries of Parishes, unless there were some filial Church of the Parish and a custom of preserving the Sacraments to be found there, and necessity for attending to the salvation of souls, as Peter says and approves in n. 28. Finally declared Benedict.

XIV. In the Bull Quamvis justo etc., given on 30 April 1749 § 24 (see in Bullar.), which induces this kind of indult to presume. Petra n. 32 autem observavit quod licet immemorabilis consuetudo in aliqua Ecclesia habeatur de servandio Sacramenti, tamen ipsa non suffragetur si constet a principio esse servatum ex sola licentia Ordinarii: nam illa possessio minime valet cum proveniat ex titulo infecto; et ita decrevit Sancta Congregatio Concilii in Neapolitana die 28 Julii 1708. Furthermore, it is to

be known that such license from the Apostolic See... Cap: III. Dub. V.

Of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrificial rite. Never is a presumption conceded for private orations and for rural chapels, unless there be an assembly of people elsewhere and distance from the parish; thus Petra n. 37 et 38. Who then observed that the right of withholding the keys of the tabernacle privately regards the parish priest; this must not be presumed either to nuns or laics on Friday of the Lord's Passion, unless there is some immemorial custom tolerated by Pignatelli and observed in Spain and the Kingdom of Sicily, and also in Naples; see Peter ibid. nn. 39-44. Furthermore, it is to be noted from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of the date 15 September 1737. Merat, quod in Communione ministranda Monialibus non sit danda benedictio cum Pyxide e fenestella, sed tantum cum dextera manu, etiamsi ibi sit praesens Sacramentum.

Moreover, that the priest, descending from the altar with the Pyxide, should descend the front steps rather than the side ones. Furthermore, it must be noted, that the reigning Pontiff Clemence. XIII. has commanded that on all Sundays during Mass the Preface for the Saints be recited. The Trinitarian Preface should not at this time have its own proper Preface. ## TRACTATUS IV. ON THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE CHAPTER I.

ON THE NATURE OF THIS SACRAMENT. DOUBT I. What is its matter and form? Concerning the matter and form of this Sacrament. See what is said about these matters in Busemb. 426 Instruction for Confessors. 427 On remote matter. Dub. 1.

Whether mortal sins committed in the reception of Baptism be the matter of this Sacrament? Fis Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction... Doubt 2. Whether confessed sins are sufficient matter for this Sacrament? Formally. Qu. I. Ani peccata aliis confessa sint materia sufficiens hujus Sacramenti? De forma. Whether the form of this Sacrament consist in the words, and can be dispensed in absentia? 429 And is there a requirement for the presence of one who morally presents? 430 Qu.

II. What form shall be used in this Sacrament for its administration? Dub. 1. In what words consists the essence of the form? And whether it is necessary that your word be? Dub. 2.

Are the words from your sins? Dub. 3. Is it the words in the name of the Father, etc.? And, are the prayers added? Dub. 4. Can the priest absolve

you through words at the same time from sins and excommunications? 431 Qu.

III. Can absolution be given validly and lawfully under a condition? Just cause for absolving under a condition. Res materia remota et necessaria est omne pec-» catum mortale, post baptismum commissum et non confessum. Verum dicitur commissum post Baptis baptismi * (contra Propos. 19 inter damnatos ab » Alexand. VIII. qua pro peccato originali perpetuam ponientiam asserebat, materia sufficiens et non necessaria est omne veniale post Baptismum commissum vel praesumptum mortale, alias rite confessum. The proximate matter is the act of contrition, confession, and satisfaction; of which the last is integral only, as is evident in the infirm, who, if by reason they are deprived, are wont to be absolved without satisfaction: the two former are essential, as commonly it is taught against Scotus, who places the whole essence in the absolution.

But sins are material only in respect to which, the act of material imposition, from which, . 5 t. 6 c. 3. ex communi. Hence resolved. Even though a mortal sin remitted in any way whatever is to be confessed with tenderness, yet if you have not committed it, you are nevertheless to confess it tenderly. Trident, sess. 14 cap. 5. Chap. I. Dub.

I. On the essence of this Sacrament. 5:3 » likewise mortal sins confessed once properly, for instance in a general confession, as Diac teaches, p. 3 t. 4 res. 56. Card. de Lugo, n. 56, contra Vict., in qua praesumptum non esse necessarium addere peccatum mortale quod post ultimam confessionem sit commissum, docent Bonac, d. 5 qu. 5 sect. 2 p. 2. 4 res. 62 et t. 3 res. 65. Card. de Lugo d. 16 sect. 2 n. 47 et quod est probabile: nisi circumstantia aliqua, v.g., speciem mutans vel reservatio casus vel proxima peccandi occasio aliud requirat et potentia sufficiens imponatur, Card. de Lugo, Tamb, de exped. conf. lib. Chapter 2, Article 1.

It is safer, however, to distinguish the new from the old. » 3. It must always be certain matter; which Sancius denies in sel. d., 7 apud 52, that whoever has not responded to divine inspirations, has not done what he could do and similar imperfections. In quibus tamen exponendis non teretur, Confessarius impedire poenitentem, ut docet. Card.

» de Lugo l.c. n. 103 contra; ut sub dubio, si materia prorsus dubia sit vel absoluta, si certa videatur. Thus Suarez, I t. VI c. III, and others commonly. Response 2. Forma. The sacrament of penance consists in the words of absolution: "I thee absolve from thy sins;" although it is with regard to the essence alone that I absolve thee, nevertheless other things should be

added, especially at the point of death; according to some sub mortal sin, according to others sub venial sin, as may be seen.

With a loud voice he pronounced upon the present; for the absent, indeed, Clement. VIII. prohibited me from absolving, under penalty of excommunication; and thus the matter is resolved. » 1. It is invalid to absolve by a gesture, by a sign, or by writing; likewise to absolve one who is absent; which Alen- sis and Medin. and others taught, but it is now prohibited, as was recently said. It is invalid to absolve by a gesture, by a sign, or by writing; likewise to absolve someone who is absent; which Alen- sis and Medin. and others taught previously, but is now forbidden or merely permitted as stated.

Valid is the absolution if done for the cause of reverence by saying: I absolve your dominion, excellence, or majesty, etc. Because the essential meaning does not change, and the words are equivalent in sense. Aversa. V. as above treated in treatise 1, chap. 1, d. 2: It is nevertheless invalid if you say: may God absolve you, or may Christ absolve you. 3. Orate prævixæ, et subsequentes formam, ut Misereatur tui, etc., et Passio Domini, etc., quæ secundum Trident. laudabiliter adduntur, non sunt necessitatis, et ex causa rationabili omitti possunt; v.g., si breves sint Confessiones, vel multi confi- dentes; ut videtis: tunc enim sufficit dicere: Absolvo te de peccatis tuis in nomine, etc.; vel si timeatur censura, Absolvo te de vinculo excommunicationis; deinde de peccatis tuis, V.

Yes, moreover. Ablution. 4. The elevation of the host and its imposition upon the head is free, although the custom should be observed. Thus where he speaks of the opening of the head.

However, the form of Clement. VIII. ut tradidit S[anctus], et Rituale Romanum est haec: quà ut omnes utantur, suadet Paulus V. ideòque omnibus tenenda memoriter: Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus, et dimissis peccatis tuis, perducat te ad vitam æternam, Amen; deinde elevata manu pergit: Indulgentiam, absolutionem, et remissionem peccatorum tuorum tribuat tibi omnipotens et misericors Dominus, Amen. Noster Dominus Iesus Christus te absolvat, et ego auctoritate ipsius te absolvo ab omni vinculo excommunicationalis, suspensionis (quæ vox circa laicos omittitur), et interdicti, in quantum possum, et tu indiges: deinde ego te absolvo d peccatis tuis, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen. Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, merits B. Of the Virgin, and of all Saints, and whatever good thou hast done, and whatever evil thou hast endured, may it be to thee in remission of sins, increase of grace, and reward of life eternal, Amen.

[TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions]
[TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions]
[TRANSLATION_ERROR after 3 attempts: 400 Client Error: Bad Request for url: http://127.0.0.1:1234/v1/chat/completions] Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance to be explained, which undoubtedly should be diligently attended to with all one's effort more than any other matter, since it contains the highest part and questions more closely related to practice in the whole of Moral Theology; and therefore I have not spared labor so as to satisfy the desire of readers and that they might find here everything necessary.

In this Doubt a prior place is treated of concerning the matter remote and the form of this Sacrament. Concerning the matter, those things alone are to be added which Busembach mentioned above as two matters in doubt. It is doubted i. Whether mortal sins committed in very reception of Baptism are the matter of this Sacrament? They commonly affirm it. 28 concl. 4.

Escob. 1. i4 n. 18 cum Vasq. et Henr. Bonaventura. Scoto, according to Augustine as related in chapter then it holds that Baptism begins to be efficacious for salvation when that fictitious confession has receded with sincere confession. Reason, because these sins, although they may occur simultaneously with Baptism in time, are nevertheless in nature themselves subsequent to the act of piety; but the reason which is adduced seems not to convince, at least it appears merely to show, that this applies to sins which one wishes to commit after receiving Baptism, but not for a sin of fiction, namely if he were to receive Baptism while existing in mortal sin without sorrow. Neither does it say that the sin of fiction is the matter of the Sacrament of Penance, but rather it says that through penance this will be removed: yet by penance there the Holy Doctor certainly does not understand Confession, but sorrow for the sin.

Neither does it hinder the text of St. Augustine, for, as the Gloss explains to Salutem, by true confession he understands the contrition of the heart. Doubt is cast. Whether other confessed sins are sufficient matter for this Sacrament? A doubt could arise from the fact that it seems not to be able to be matter for this Sacrament of Penance a sin already remitted, since guilt once removed cannot be removed again. But the affirmative judgment is certain among all, as it teaches Chapter I.

Dubium. The sentence. On the essence of this Sacrament. Hist. 51j, I, q. 3, art. 3, qu. 5, ad 4, et dist. 18, q. 1, art. 3, q. 2, ad 4 quem communiter sequuntur 18 sect. 4. Palau's treatise, book 23, distinction 1, chapter 6, note 5, with others frequently throughout. And it is clearly evident from Extrav. 1 de Privil. (page mihi 238.) 8. verum, in fin. ubi Bened.

XI. dicit: Licet de necessitate non sit iterum eadem confiteri peccata, tamen ut eorumdem peccatorum iteretur confessio, reputamus saluber. That is confirmed by common practice of the faithful. It does not hinder to say that a sin which has been forgiven is no longer a sin; for although a sin, once forgiven, remains as a committed sin; yet it suffices that the Sacrament have an effect in the act of preclusion, namely, that it provides a deletive grace of sin, even though by chance in its own acting it does not eliminate the sin. As regards however the form of this sacrament, more questions need to be discussed here. It is asked I.

Whether essentialiter in verbis consistat haec Sacramentis forma Responde. Affirmatively, since form cannot be expressed otherwise than by voice, nor by Scripture or other signs: this is commonly and certainly held by all, according to D. 84, art. 3, ad 3; those who follow thus are Lugo, d. 13, sect. 6. Bonac. qu. 5 p. 6. 27, et cum Val. et alii passim. Herefore Clemens. On the 20th day of June in the year 1602, by Constitutions published, this proposition was proscribed as false and rash: that it is permissible to confess sacramentally through letters or through a confessor absent, and to obtain absolution from the same person who is absent; and this has been reserved under excommunication for itself, so that it might incur such a penalty if ever this proposition were defended in any plausible manner or brought about in practice in any way.

From which words rightly it is inferred that absolution absent in any case not only is given illicitly, but also invalidly; for if the Pontiff merely had declared it illicit, at some time, through urgent necessity, it could validly and licitly be given, since ecclesiastical laws cannot bind with a grave disadvantage, and especially according to Book 518 Chapter 8. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. more if that is spiritual.

Wherefore, if the Pontiff wished that such a kind of absolution be in no case licit, he consequently declared that it had never been validly caused by Paul; moreover on July 14, 1605, he further damaged the interpretation of some concerning the aforementioned Decree, who said that absolution could be conferred to an absent person provided that the Confession preceded in the presence: for he explained the Bull of Clement as disjunctively, not copulatively, to be understood: therefore it is necessary that the Form from the Confessional be pronounced vocally there and

then, and that the penitent be morally present there. This moral presence is considered that one within which men commonly speak with a voice although more elevated, and they usually do so, as Sporer says, n. 610. . 5. de v. I said, 29 who, with Sporer and others, adds that such presence can be extended to about twenty paces, especially where the penitent has not yet emerged from the sight of the confessional. Indeed rightly, Sporer notes n. 615, with Reginald and Bonacursus: without scruple absolve the penitent who has withdrawn from the confessional, if certainly it is known that he is still within a few paces. However, it merited; for presence requires a greater proximity for absolution than for hearing a sermon, and moreover, if on account of danger of infection or some other reason the Confessor could not enter the room where the sick person is, he might absolve him from the door.

Indeed, rightly Sporer n. 610 advises. Croix n. 1201. c. cum Stoz. non esse opus ut poenitens verba absolutionis audiat et tanto minus ut eadem intelligat sufficit ut Sacerdos illa vere proferat. Certainly, here is the literal English translation of the target sentence: Quinimo sapienter dicit Croix, consultum Cap. I.

Dub. I. On the essence of this Sacrament. 316 threads so that the aforementioned words are submissively pronounced in the presence of other penitents, lest if anyone is remitted without absolution, others perceive it. Tambur adds that he can well absolve a penitent who previously had given in writing an account of his sins and then at the present Confession would say to these: He accused me of these. Quod tamen advertunt cum Cano, et quia licet nullo jure praeceptum sit, ut Confessio fiat vocali- ter, tamen, cum communi Ecclesiae usu sit receptus modus sic confitendi, hic nunc obtinet vim praecepti, et proinde sine gravi causa foret illicita Confessio aliter facta.

It is inquired about II. What form is to be used in this Sacrament 43a? Several serious Authorities hold that formerly the Church used the form of prayer (May God absolve you) until the middle of the century. XIII et quod etiam hodie haec sit in usu apud Graecos; ita. Turn, in Præl.

Martene, 9 p. 528. But this they deny, namely Baronius, Gonet, and Concim. But our common Theologians of Moral Theology, n. 639, hold that the form of prayer is invalid, because Christ, the Lord, instituting this Sacrament (John 20), expressed that the judgment should be rendered by the Priest as Judge, saying; 'Whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them.' Wherefore it seems that it has been shown necessary, that the sins be remitted by the priests themselves, as vicars of Christ; and that it is not sufficient that they pray to God for the remission of their own sins. But

whatever it may be concerning this, certain is it today that from the point of view of faith the proper form is the indicative form: as the Holy Synod taught in these words: "I have given instruction regarding the Sacrament of Penance."

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: in that form of contrition in which especially the power is vested, it has been fittingly established by the words of the Minister, "I absolve you," etc., to which prayers the Holy Church customarily joins certain laudable petitions. Upon this form many doubts occur.

Doubt is cast - 1. Do you mean to say that this form consists of these words? It is certain among all, that the words "essentia formae" pertain to subsobvia. The sentiency of Lugodep penit. d. 1 3 n. 2 6. Wig. t r. 1 3 q. 3 res: 2. quod, sidicatur, Absolvod peccati sui, nonsit necessarium ad valo rem formæ verbum Tuis, cum hoc satis exprimatur in verbo Tuis.

However, the most common opinion on this matter contradicts your Sentences on Penitence, d. 1, sect. 9, n. 1, 7. Bon. q. 4 p. 1 n. 1: . 4 8 2. Concinnatogp. 580 n. 5 et 23 d. u n: p. 5 ' n: 2 cum Vasq. First opinion, speaking speculatively, seems more probable; but since this is indeed less certain, yet in practice it is not to be followed according to the authority of the Doctors, as condemned by Proposition 2 from Innocent. XI: Dubitatur; 2: Respondendo, ego absolvo, requirantur verba peccati tuis?

They commonly deny P. Mil ante propos. 1. Innoc. The beginning of the proposal. Innocent. Contradictorium perpens: 5 8 0 n: 5. . 4 8 2. . c. 2 q. 3.

Spore the same tit. p. 244 n. 544. . 5 n. 2: et Lugod 13 n. 17. cum S: Anton. Sylv. Cajet. Navar, etc. exD. Th. 3 p. q. 8 art. 4: etcatech.

Rom. p. 2 n. 1 4. Obidicitur: est autem forma, ego absolvo, et nihil aliud ibi additur. All the doctors say that even if a sin is such, it is not necessary for the essence of the form; but nevertheless these mortal words to be omitted, since it is contrary to the custom of the Church. Others prefer that which pertains to the essence, namely: "Whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted," etc., as it is said: "Who said sins, it must be explained thus: who said sins; so too 'Croix n. 6 3 3: both Major and Pasiq. ac Mazzotta de penit. t o. 3 p, 5 6 r. with Gabr." Turned away, Gorm. etc., through the marsh. P.: Soto, et Gabr. ad pp: III n. r: Necesse est dicere, quod Cap. I.

Dub. I. On the essence of this Sacrament. The words, "Ego te absolvo," must be sufficiently determined by circumstances in order to signify

presumed absolution from sins; for if this were valid, the word "te" could still be withheld, which is presumed with sufficient circumstances. The first opinion is more probable, but in practice one should not deviate from the second, since a presumed probability is considered legitimate, as they rightly observe. Num. 25. 2. cc. It is doubted thirdly. Whether the words, In nomine Patris, etc., are part of the essence? Durand affirms it. d. 13 n. 11.

But the common and true opinion denies this, since in the institution of this Sacrament Christ made no mention of it. Regarding this invocation of the Saints. He made it congruent with the Trinity in the Sacrament of Baptism: thus Lugo n. 12 (who says that it is opposed by all and should be rejected) cum etc. Croix num. 629 cum Arriaga et Bosco, and also 637 mortal; but others, such as Sotus, say that this opinion does not seem sufficiently probable, since such an invocation is according to the custom of the Church: hence most commonly do others say it is only venial, as Bon. l. e. p. 5 n. 3. c. Platell. Bosco, and others at Croix num. 637 who absolutely assert that to be common. The words however of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc., thinks 10 cannot be omitted without guilt: but the words Misereatur, Indulgentiam, et Passio Domini nostri, etc., says can be omitted; and to this seems to favor the Roman Ritual (tit. de forma absol.) saying: In more frequent confessions... they may be omitted, Misereatur, etc., and it will suffice to say, Our Lord Jesus Christ, etc., up to that, Passio, etc. But in urgent cases some, under grave necessity in danger of death, can briefly say them. I absolve thee from all censures and sins, in the name of the Father etc. But commonly the D.D. . 322 Lib.

VI. Treat. IV. Of the Sacrament. Penitence. They say that all these prayers can be omitted without any sin; thus Lugo d. 13 n. 9 cum page 491 cum, Mazott. t; 3 p. 163: also Saboroso, Dicast. et Hocquenghem seem to hold this view, since the Tridentine dictum sect. 14 e. 3 says that these prayers should only be added laudably, for it seems that no praiseworthy word would import a precept.

No one however doubts that it is more fitting to add such prayers at least in Confessions of this kind: especially those which follow: Passion of the Lord, etc., since it is probable, as stated by D. Thomas, S. Augustine, and others, as we shall explain below regarding Satisfaction, that through these words all good works of the penitent are elevated to Sacramental Satisfaction; at least they are consulted: let them be said while the penitent recedes. Doubt is cast. 4. A n. per verbate solvique possit sacer dos valide absolvere poenitentem tam à peccatis quàm à censuris? Commonly affirmed. 5. Bon. p. 5 n. 1 0. . 2 q. 3. . 3 n. 1 1. . 7 a. 2 n. 3. . 4 8 2. v.

Institution. Rituale. Reason, which prohibits nothing, that words may be intended by priests in directing absolution both from sins and censures as well as penances. But they also advert to merit. 1 1. c c. When Gran and Leand., as well as Sotus, Coninchius, and Ayila, state that this is not to be excused from venial sin, even though it is a matter of the Church's discipline. However, Holzm. n. 4, 9 ret. c c. cum Gran. id omnino excusat; nam, si aliqua probabilissima suspicio sit quod poenitens aliquam censuram mincrrerit,

Otherwise rightly it was P. Concinap. 6 1 8 n. 9, peccarem mortaliter Sacerdotem, qui contra prohibitionem Ecclesie vellet poenitentem absolvere prius à peccatis, et deinde à censuris? But according to the most common opinion, that which validly can be absolved a penitent from sins (if he is in good faith) is not the absolution from censures without having been absolved from sins, as they teach. 4 de Rel: d. 3, 1 sect. 3 n. 6. 1, 2 c. 8 n. 5. Lugo; d. 1 4 n. 1 0 2. et. Chapter 3 number 1.

Ratio, quiaprohibitio Ecclesie ne invalidare Sacra Cap. I, Dub. I. On the essence of this Sacrament. 5 25 chin, whose value depends on divine law, since all that is required for its essential nature concur therein. It is asked III. Whether absolution can be given validly and lawfully under a condition?

All agree, as we said in reverse, commonly saying that DD. consider it invalid if the condition is future; and this also, if one says, "I absolve you, if God knows that you will restore," or similar, as we held in no. 26. The difficulty is whether it is licit to absolve under a condition concerning the present or the past? Resp. affirmatively with the common DD. against the others, according to the sentiment of n. 28; provided that there be a just cause: namely, if by denying the absolution notable detriment would imminently threaten the soul of the penitent. Justa vero causæ, secundum Doctores infra ci-432 tandos, videntur haec. I.

If the Priest prudently doubts whether he will absolve or not: thus Lugo, d. 13, num. 107. Cross 1. 6 p. 2 n. 177o. Sporer n. 622. c. 4 q. 6. R. 3. Indulgence of penance, p. 3 num. 1 cum.

Molf. Reg. et si Confessarius dubitet, an habeat jurisdictionem in poenitentem; ita. n. 622. But I would not admit this, unless the penitent were long deprived of absolution; and in this case I hold that the confessor ought to disclose to the penitent who has confessed mortal sins, that he himself is only absolved conditionally, so that if later on it should happen that the fact becomes known that the confessor really lacked jurisdiction,

the penitent would again confess those sins, as he ought. III. If necessity should arise for receiving the Eucharist, as Mazotta and others say, but this is to be incidentally noted; for although someone could be absolved under condition in such a necessity, because such necessity provides sufficient cause for the Confessor to absolve under condition, nevertheless the penitent would not be able to approach Communion unless certainly disposed for that (or at least sufficiently prepared, according to those cited below n. 474 dub. 2.) §24 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: for this reason, that it may preserve the Apostle's precept, which says that all who come should be proven; hence in a mere negative doubt no one can receive Communion from his disposition. IV.

If there is doubt whether a penitent is rightly disposed through true sorrow and purpose; as Sporer l.c., Maz-zotta to. 3 p. 168 et cum Vasq. etc. But I cannot acquiesce so generally to this doctrine: for I say that it is not possible to absolve under the condition of a recidivist sinner in deadly sins, who is not proven disposed through extraordinary signs, as we shall say below from n. 459, unless he be in danger of death; or (excepting) prudently feared; so that such a sinner may return more often to Confession, and lest thereby his sins should increase. I say that it is likewise to be said concerning the recidivist in venial sins, who has the use of reason, because, since this penitent can hereby himself soon render certain through experiment by delaying absolution, it does not seem that there is sufficient cause for absolving him under such a condition. I say thirdly, it can probably be absolved a boy! or one who is half-demented, under condition, when there is doubt about their disposition; and especially if there looms the danger of death, or the Easter precept, commonly decreed by the DDs with the Confession chapter 6. Lugo, d. 17, n. 22, et aliis: tales esse absolvendos sub conditione, si dubie sint dispositii; maximé si confessi sint aliquod dubium mortale, quo casu ait Lug.: non videri de hoc dubitandum. I think this is entirely to be condemned (contra Lessium) as presumptuous outside the time of death or a command, as more truly say Sporer n. 622. And even if one says at least that it can be absolved in such a case, for there is not only a just cause of utility, lest the penitent be deprived of sacramental grace, but also a presumed necessity, lest he remain in mortal sin; to such an extent, however, those who are otherwise well-endowed with the use of reason should not be absolved when there is doubt about their disposition, because there is a way and hope that, through delayed absolution, they will soon return to certain disposition and be absolved; but Chapter I.

Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 325 This is why these

semiparadiseans and children, who are not yet capable of perfect reason, lack this way and hope that they will soon attain this certain disposition. But Sporer and Mazzotta II. cc., and according to Croix n. 1797, do not disapprove of absolving such children, even if they have committed only slight sins, so that they are not long deprived of sacramental grace, and so that they remain not in mortal sin, should they perhaps be in it, as Lugo says there. They say that it is probable to absolve under this condition (as Bonac p. 3 n. 1 thinks). The patient pious one who confesses only certain imperfections about which there is doubt whether they reach the level of venial sins; yet I would often not admit this, nor if he could provide a certain matter from previous life. Moreover, since the penitent does not provide certain matter, the confessor is not bound to seek it out in order to absolve; and in a case where he seeks but does not find certain matter, Sporer says in n. 56 that he is not bound to absolve under such a condition, for then the penitent would have no certain right to such an absolution when he does not provide certain matter, or at least dubiously necessary matter. ## DUBIUM II. ### WHAT CONTRITION IS REQUIRED? 443 See what is found in Busemb. de Dolore et Propositio. ### §. I.

Of the questions pertaining to sorrow: What is penance as a virtue? And what is it as a Sacrament? I. Whether contrition consists in pain, or in detestation? II. Why is contrition to be elicited from what reason?

III. When is the precept of contrition obligatory? Dub. 1. Is an obligation imposed by reason of imminent danger? And whether its delay be a special sin?

Dub. 2. Whether one who has confessed on his deathbed with attrition is thereafter bound to express contrition thus? Dub. 3. Does a precept of contrition oblige on feast days? §26 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. 438 Qu. Fourth. Are individual contritions required for justification in relation to each individual sin?

V. In confession, are explicit acts of Faith and Hope required? 340 Qu. VI. In the Sacrament, is attrition sufficient without a predominant love? Does any contrition remove a sin outside the Sacrament? And can a sin remain with a predominant clarity if it has been remitted? The objections are resolved where it was established that an inchoate love is concluded in attrition.

VII. Does attrition from fear of temporal punishments suffice? VIII. Can penance be at any time valid and informative? IX.

Does pain have to precede Confession? 446 Qu. X. By what measure of time will the act of sorrow morally continue to persevere? 447 Qu. Eleven. Whether a penitent ought to elicit an act of sorrow with the intention of confessing it? 448 Qu.

XII. Whether one who confesses a forgotten sin immediately after absolution is bound to elicit anew the act of sorrow? 449 Qu. XIII. How is the elicitation of pain in the confession of venial sins to be conducted? Dub. 1.

Whether it is mortal to confess venials without any pain? Dub. 2. Is it sufficient to grieve over one sin in the confession of venial sins without another? Is frequency of venial sins sufficient? ibid. ## § II. On questions pertinent to the purpose. 450 Qu.

I. Is a virtual or implicit purpose sufficient? II. What are the necessary conditions for a true proposed purpose? And they are I.

That it may be firm. What, if a penitent believes with certainty that he will relapse? II. That it may be Universal. Is it required that there be a universal intention regarding mortals?

III. That it may be Effective. 452 Qu. III. How should the confessor conduct himself with those who are in a situation of temptation to sin? Question 1.

How manyfold is the occasion, and how manyfold the danger of sinning? And what occasion should be avoided? 453 Dub. 2. Whether he who does not wish to remove a probable occasion of sin can be absolved? Or. I, Doubtful.

H. On the essence of this Sacrament. 5ay 454 Dub.3. Whether he who is in a proximate voluntary occasion may be absolved once or twice? Can those who are in a necessary proximate occasion be absolved once or again? Especially concerning the cause of its own art or office. Sentence to be held regarding absolution is deferred here. Dub. 5.

May one be absolved who, in a proximate necessary occasion, having already employed remedies and yet has relapsed in the same manner? The doctrine of Saint Charles Borromeo is annotated. IV. How should

Casfessarius be dealt with regarding those who are habitual sinners on account of intrinsic frailty and how regarding recidivists. Can a recidivist be absolved without extraordinary signs? What are extraordinary signs? Is the certainty of the penitent's disposition sufficient for his absolution? May the disposition for absolution of the penitent be delayed without his consent? Would it be expedient or not to delay the absolution? Why rather should the absolution be delayed for those who are in an extrinsic occasion, and not for recidivists on account of intrinsic frailty? Serporo, quod contritio in communis sit dolor at detestationis peccati commissi cum propositum eman - didi, ut habeat Trident. sess. 1 4.

When there is a division in perfect contrition, which is said of absolution; and in imperfect contrition, which is said of attrition. It is perfect, which is elicited by the motive of charity on account of the supreme love of the Two: and this excess alms justifies, and I wish it to be in order of confession, which indeed ought to be made. It is imperfect, which proceeds from a lower motive, even though supernatural in nature, it is considered. Resp. This sacrifice suffices for the imperfect, and requires the material and trinitarian form to be supernatural, efficacious, and universal, showing respect for the concept of the order to confession, or at least to absolution.

It is surrounded by a fence. See Bon. d. 5 q. 5. et Sohol. secollit urex. cit. And the bond is solved. 2 t. Not a pretended contrition is required, as Gaubil desired, q. Not suffices. Attrition is estimated to be so much; although it has culpability; what indeed is attrition according to segonditas. §28 Lib. VI.

Treatise. IV.: Concerning the Sacrament of Penance. 2. Neither desire for absolution without affection towards sins: this is also held by common opinion against the Angles and certain others who follow it, as stated in the first expedient confession. Chapter 3.

Consider whence a grave sin is committed, who presumptuously confesses solely venial sins, or solely mortal sins other than those confessed, without any formal sorrow, and indeed exposes himself to the danger of sacrilege by not placing the matter of the Sacrament. Thus Cardinal de Lugo in the fourteenth section. » 8 and common. Good. d. 6 qu. 3 sect. 1 p. 3.

Nevertheless, it is not necessary that the sorrow extend to all venial sins of which the penitent is conscious; rather, he notes that one form of sorrow for a single venial sin suffices, even if he be conscious of many, of which he has no disposition to amend, whether he confesses them or not. 3. He is

not absolved who grieves, even though he grieve intensely, solely on account of infamy, damages, or other temporal penalties precisely, even if from innocent ignorance: Because there is no supernatural grief; nor can ignorance or good faith supply an essential defect. Bonac. l. c. etc. Tamen limitat Regin. cum conf. l. 1 c. 1 nisi doleas propter istas, ut a Deo inflectas vel infligendas. » 4.

No intention nor duration of time is required for attrition, as Durandus desires. » 5. To attrition no intention is required, nor duration of time, as Durand desires. Even though it should be about all mortal sins, yet individual pains are not required for each individual sin, as Angles desires; but one act taken together from all, presumptuously forgotten: hence he who knowingly and prudently is not grieved universally concerning all mortal sins not yet remitted gravely sins. cc. 6. Pain is not sufficient, that you do not pain, as Navarre and Salignac say, nor the will not to sin.

The affection of both is, because there is no sorrow for sins committed, with which that affection can remain steadfast in them. Where rightly is not. Cap. I.: Dub, If. On the essence of this Sacrament. When one feels pain in himself, so as not to feel pain from sins committed, it is commonly joined with a desire for the remission of sins, even though the penitent does not consider them worthy [of forgiveness]. » 7. Even though this pain ought to be the greatest aversion: so that you detest nothing more than sin and all evils of this world, especially mortal sin against God; yet it is not necessary, nor expedient, to make particular comparisons: for example, I would rather suffer this or that evil than commit mortal sin, because such things are dangerous. * (And this is common among all, and the less reason there is to choose hell, since according to the present providence of God, as hell is destined for those who are confirmed in sin through an abominable hatred towards God, it would be incongruous for a man to avoid sin by choosing hell, in which he could not remain without sin.) 8.

Qui non vult occasiones proximas peccandi a se amoliri, vel non remittere ex animo, vel non restituere, aut satisfacere quibus debet, vel non habet formale (licet probabiliter cum Lugo loc. c. sect. 5. : aliqui dicant virtuale in contritione universali inclusum sufficere saltem quando non occurrit cogitatio de peccatis vitandis) propositum peccata mortalia, quando talia confitetur, vitandi efficax, idest cum quo non possit consistere affectus actualis erga aliquod mortale, non est sufficiens attritus. The reason is, because it is not a pain and an efficacious detestation, indeed with which the will can remain regarding some mortal sin, nor he who totally turns himself to God, detesting the sin above all detestable things. 1. 5. tr. 6 c. 4. Diana page 3: treatise 4. R. 119 etc. commun. And although you confess solely the venial fault, yet there remains a fitting sorrow for it, namely

such an presumptuous purpose at least virtually to have had regarding it.

Card. de Lugo d. sec. 8 et 9 et alii... §50 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: » 9.

To return frequently with the same mortal sin is not a certain indication of lack of attrition; although it is a great presumption, especially in those who are required to confess themselves to parents, masters, etc., and also in those who, though warned, do not separate from their concubines or make restitution, by whom therefore absolution must be deferred until they perform this act. Although other signs of true sorrow may be present, such as if the prescribed means have been used for avoiding occasions of sin, if the number of sins has been diminished, if the penitent has entirely asserted that he is his own accuser, defender, and witness—this last point being one to which much credit should generally be given, since he himself accuses, defends, and testifies in his own case; in this matter there is need for great prudence on the part of the Confessor, lest he turn away the penitent by severity, nor lead him into presumption through leniency, and so sin with him and perish with him. 32 s. 2. ». 2 in dec. c. 32 et 1. 3 c. 5. Card. de Lug. » 1. c. n. 166 et 169 contra quorum, aliorumque communem sententiam, docent apud ., et Joannes Sancus d. 10 n. 16, posse toties quoties confitetur absolvi, etiamsi nullus appareat profectus; eo quod sine illo posuit esse verum propositum congruent est in his qui venialia semper afferunt eadem. » But I do not approve that, *on account of the recently condemned opinions by Innoc*.

XI. Propos. 60 and 61) * it does not seem to be a sufficient reason. See Conin. d. 2 dub. 14. R. 45 et p. 3 t. 4. 10.

Those who, out of office duty, from home; or in a matter involving near danger of sin, refuse to withdraw because without great difficulty they cannot do so, are absolved interim measures to employ. The reason is that an occasion, a presumptively near one, does not necessarily have to be avoided; yet it can remain when there is a purpose of avoiding sin. It matters not what one thinks or fears that he will not avoid committing one or more sins: for the purpose is an act of will; but such estimation is an act of intellect, which does not necessarily follow from that purpose on account of the mutability of human will. Meanwhile, he who is certain that it is impossible for him to be in such an occasion. Dub.

II: Concerning the essence of this Sacrament. 55: » To avoid sins, one should desert it, unless he wishes to perish. "Thus. C. Lugo'li. c. n. 152." » 11. No se requiere dolor sensible; basta el intelectivo: ya que como este es

interno y espiritual, no deben dificultosamente acercarse al Sacramento sin dolor, porque no sienten nada. » 12. Non requiritur sensibilis dolor; sufficit enim intellectivus: qui cum sit internus ac spiritualis, scru- pulosi non facile debent angi, quasi sine dolore accedant ad Sacramentum, eo quod nullam sentiant.

He who elicited attrition from confession without thinking about it and did not refer it to the Sacrament, cannot approach that with new attrition without new pain, because a part must be referred to the whole. Therefore, 20 sections. 4. Good. D. V. Q. III P. II. However, it seems contrary that Cardinal de Lugo teaches in his treatise, book 14, section 4, note 37, that this is not improbable. . i c. 2.

13. Dolor, qui sequitur absolutionem, non sufficit ad Sacramentum; imò secundum sententiam saltem tutiorem, quam docet 5 c. 4 et Coninc, debet antecedere praesumptam confessionem, etsi contrarium probabiliter doceant Vasq. Son. "Fag." Gard. de Lugo: of penit. on the 14th day of the second and Gasp.

Hurt » that. d. 6 diff. 5 apud . t, 7. Reply 6. Un- » dè penitentes initio ad dolorem excitandi: aut si » post narrationem peccatorum fiat, repetant verbum » confessionis, dicendo se dolere de peccatis expostulatis. See c. 14. It is probable that he who a little while ago confessed and again confesses the same sins or those which have ceased, about which previously (explicitly, and in particular) he did not feel sorrow, should not be elicited to a new feeling of sorrow; Card. de Lugo d. 14 sect. 3.

R. 5 et 5 i et consequenter potest moribundus propter periculum instantis mortis absolveri, audito tantum uno altero vel peccato, et deinde si superstes maneat, auditis reliquis iteratò absolveri in virtute doloris praecedentis; unde distinctè de his agere oportet. § I. On questions concerning Pain. 434 Before all things, it should be noted that penance is to be understood in a twofold sense; namely, as a Virtue and as a Sacrament: For virtue is defined as such: A virtue tending towards the destruction of sin inasmuch as it is an offense against God, through medium of pain and satisfaction. As for the Sacrament, it is defined thus: The Sacrament consists in the acts of Penance; and in the absolution legitimately pronounced by the Priest according to the mode of judgment. Penitence indeed as a virtue was at all times necessary for the middle necessity to Salvation; but in the Law and Gospel it is also as a Sacrament necessarily required by the middle necessity for all fallen ones after Baptism, at least in voto, if the Sacrament cannot be received in reality. Question NoneI. Ut Sacramentum vero definitur: Sacramentum consistens in actibus Pœnitentis; et Sacerdotis legitime absolventis in modum judicii.

Whether Penitence consists in sorrow, or in detestation? They say that contrition consists in pain, who presuppose detestation, as Gonet. d. 7 n. 6 etc., according to Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 657. Others however say that it consists in detestation, which follows from pain; and this opinion is sufficiently common, and appears more true according to 4 sect, 1 n. 7. Cajet. Reg. c. ex D. r ubi docet: Exigitur ad remissionem... ut homo actualiter peccatum commissum detestetur.

Reason, because it is not indeed pain that is the cause of detestation, but detestation that is the cause of pain; and therefore pain is useful, because it proceeds from the detestation of sin; which primarily consists in the abolition of guilt, since it is a matter of willing not to have sinned. Moreover, as rightly say Frassen t. 10 p. 529 with Vega, and c. with Con., it is by no means to be doubted that in contrition both are required, namely, sorrow and detestation; and that one exercise contains the other; for he who detests his sin necessarily does so from himself feel sorrow; and conversely, he who feels sorrow over his sin necessarily detests it. Ap. I. Doubt.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 355 Inquiry. II. For what reason should the act of perfect contrition be elicited? First opinion; which is held by many, states that it can be elicited from the motive of any Divine Attribute, such as Justice, Wisdom, Mercy, etc., offended against. And rightly do they consider this probable. Section 2, paragraph 2, note 13 and Lugo, day 5, note 4.

Reason: Quicumque diligit Divinam Justitiam vel Misericordiam propter Deum, jam Deum diligit; cumque Misericordia et Justitia Divina sint ipse Deus: ergo qui dolet de peccato ob offensam Divinae Mi- sericordiae vel Justitiae, non jam ex mo- tivo concupiscentiae sed propter Deum dolet. The second however is the common and more probable opinion, which they hold, namely that an offense against the Divine Goodness, inasmuch as this includes all the perfections of God. Reason, because of: namely, ineffable; the object however of Charity, as commonly taught by the Doctors, and as we said in lib. 2 n. 24. The object is God inasmuch as He is infinite Goodness, namely the root and aggregate of all perfections. Questio.

III. When is the precept of Contrition obligatory? 437 In itself speaking, it is certain among all that it obliges in the hour of death; see however, by accident, commonly do the DD. oblige I. When anyone would be in mortal sin, and should need to receive sacramental ministration or some

sacrament of the living, thus Bonaventure says in his fifth question, fifth session, first part, page two, with Vasquez. Val. et Fill. ac et II. When one should suffer great temptations which he thought he could not avoid unless an act of contrition elicited and with canonical penance.

When one is bound to elicit an act of Charity toward God, then, in the presence of memory of sin, one is bound to detest his own sin, as rightly Holzma says, page 131, note 518. Doubt is cast. 1. Would an extra peril of death ever oblige the precept of Contrition, and its postponement be a special sin? The first opinion affirms what Juven holds in book i, page 9, paragraph 416. Ron. de poeni. c. 1 q. 3 R. 2.

Antoine p. 498. cum item Ales. et Gab. apud Probatur i. ex illo: Non tardes converti ad Dominum, et ne differas de die in diem; subito enim veniet ira illius. 8 et 9. It is proved from the precept of charity, which without doubt obligates per se frequently in life, therefore the precept of contrition obligates presumptuously frequently. The second opinion denies this, and those who hold this view are five. I said it, and also Cajetan and Durand, with whom he considers it probable. But I hold that these sentiments can easily be reconciled.

Speaking per se, a sinner differing penance extraneous to the peril of death probably does not commit a special sin with the second opinion. Reason, because affirmative precepts, as D. teaches, ought to have a determined time within which they should be fulfilled; yet nowhere is it established what determined time suffices for contrition to satisfy this precept: whence the same Doctor in II. 2, q. 14, art. 2 said that final impenitence is not a special sin in this manner, namely, if one remains in sin until death... then it would not be a special sin, but rather some circumstance of sin, etc. Nevertheless, properly speaking, this should be understood with respect to a precise positive precept: for from the precept of annual confession prescribed by the Church, each without doubt is bound to perform contrition, at least once in a year. This nevertheless is to be understood per se loquendo, but I think per accidens that he can in no way be excused by a mortal sin who, existing in mortal sin, would defer penance for a notable period of time. Then because he would have sinned against the precept of charity towards God, which whoever whatsoever obliges himself at least plurally to observe in any one year, according to what is said in book 2 number 8. Then because he would otherwise sin against Charity towards himself, by exposing himself to the danger of new faults towards his neighbor, Chapter I.

Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 355 By succumbing to temptations: the reason is evident from what D. Thom. teaches in I. II.

quaest. 109 art. 8 (followed by Gonet and Roncagl.), where he says: Without justifying grace, it cannot remain free from mortal sin for a long time. Wherefore D. Gregor. in his commentary on Ezekiel. Hom. 11 dixit: Peccatum, quod mox per penitentiam non deletur, suo pondere ad aliud trahit.

What however this notable time is, very greatly the DD. [disagree] differ. Conc. holds to be a week; the same seems to think so; but when: and it appears that this opinion clings to him. c. in 4 Sent. But I by no means acquiesce; for the space seems to me sufficiently notable, so that one who exists for such a length of time in mortality may easily avoid the danger of falling again elsewhere. It does not hinder to say that the Church has determined a time for the year indiscriminately with respect to all; for the Church has determined this time alone for the obligation of Confession, not however for penance. I do not deny, however, that sinners, especially those who are inexperienced, can be most readily, nay almost always, excused from this delayed penance on account of inadvertence.

Dubit, 2: Whether one who has received the Sacrament of Penance with contrition at the point of death (supposing that contrition without predominant charity is a sufficient disposition, according to what is said in the question). Furthermore, would it be necessary to elicit an act of Contrition? First, the opinion affirms this, and thus Suarez holds it, in his Decretum, distinction 14, section 6, note 18; also in his Commentary, book 1, note 34. Good question 5 part 2 number 5. Concise volume 9 page 56 note 5.

Antoine page 498 Reply 2 and Val. c. 1 n. 35. Reason, because according to the law of charity, in the article of death each one is bound to seek the safer remedies so as to be liberated from every danger of eternal damnation. The second opinion denies this, and this is held by Lugo, Decree 7, number 163, section 4. Sporer n. 174. Escob. lib. 14 n. 130. et lib. 1336.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. n. 30. with the Council of Beaucaire, Saldas, Fag. Turri and others many, very probable, consider Suarez.

Reason, because, granted that it is morally certain that simple attrition suffices in the Sacrament for obtaining Grace, there is no mortal danger to salvation in this: But a man at any time, whether of life or death, is not tried unless with a view to choosing means that are safe for salvation, but not safer. Both opinions are probable, but the first must certainly be

preferred when it concerns the supreme matter of salvation, whose danger is irremediable. Nimirum dico, illam debeo omnino sequi quem esset in actuali articulo mortis; nam et quisque tenetur clicere actum Charitatis (ut tenendum cum et cum cui nemo potest satisfacere, si occurrente memoria peccati ex eodem Charitatis movente peccatum non detestetur). Dubit. 3. Does the precept of Contrition oblige on feast days? Marsilius, P. Soto, etc., affirm that the observance of Festivals was instituted for the purpose that holy Souls may be sanctified.

But Canus and Dom say otherwise. Soto, Armill., etc. with reference to what was said in chapter 3 note 264. Dubit: 4. Whether a confession vow in conjuration should be explicit is doubted: 4. It is certain from 4 that sins are not remitted except by the vow of the Sacrament of Penance: it is doubtful whether this vow should be explicitly held?

Canus affirms on page 4, question 2, and tome 9, page 104, question because those things which are necessary from the necessity of the middle are explicitly to be proposed to them to whom the law is already manifest. They, however, commonly and more probingly deny it, according to Scotus, Alensis, Adamo, and Filius. Medium and others. Reason 1 because from the very Council of Trent it is held that this vow is included in the Confession, as session 14 chapter 5 says thus: Reconciliation (which is obtained through perfect contrition) itself to Contrition, without the sacramental vow which is included in that, not to be attributed Chapter I. Doubt.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 337 bendam. That which is included in another is implicit, not explicit. Reason 2, because those who have knowledge of Confession do not need to recall Confession while it is being made; it suffices that they do not exclude it; therefore, for remission of sin, it is not essential to the matter of Contrition that the vow of Confession be explicit. - Question NoneIV.

To achieve justification, 435 requires for each sin a separate act of sorrow? They affirm, 1 and Angles according to Busembach as stated above. Others, however, as Sotus, Canus, and Med., in section 4, chapter 8, note 4, said, even merely one act of sorrow is required, which detests all peccata distinctè known. But most certainly to be observed in opposition to the common opinion, as Conea relates on page 66, note 7. Juvenin. de secunda quaestio, articulus 5, tertia parte, quaestio 87, articulus 1.

Sporer n. 89. Cross n. 737. and n. 215, no. 79. with Soto, Mastr., and others frequently. All these teach that it is not necessary to apply a

particular act of sorrow for each individual sin, which Cajetan says would be ridiculous; nor is it required that sorrow be referred to sins distinctly recollected, but it suffices to have universal contrition for all; and this opinion is held by D. Thomas, even though at first sight it seems contrary to what we say below (infra), for in V, ad 4 he explicitly teaches thus: All sins agree in aversion from God, on account of which they impede grace; hence, in the moment of justification it is not necessary that anyone think about individual sins, but it suffices that one thinks about this, namely, what by his guilt he is turned away from God. Recogitatio vero singulorum peccatorum debebit vel praecedere, vel saltèm sequi justificationem. Understand in accordance with justification, so that it may be rightly explained.

The same [person] taught the Catechism. Roman. § 3 ubi, quamvis antecedenter hortetur ut peccator sua criminata singulatim detestetur, tamen ibidem sic subdit: Is enim (Deus), cum nostra salutis cupidissimus. Book. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, it is such that it does not delay in granting us forgiveness; rather, it embraces the sinner with paternal charity as soon as he has confessed himself and detested all his sins, which he will then, at another time (if opportunity permits), recall individually to confess and detest from his heart, thereby turning himself to God. This sentence is approved from that: Impiety towards the impious will not harm him on whatever day he may turn to Him. Ezechiel 33 v. 12. Therefore he spoke.

Leo apud Deum nullas patitur moras verus convertitus. And St. John. Deum quantumcumque, qualemlibet brevi tempore gestam paenitentiam non respuere. It is proven by two reasons. The first reason is that which D. Thomas affirms above, namely, since sins consist in an aversion from God, it suffices for the recovery of grace, that the sinner be converted to God through one act of contrition; for if the sinner did not recover grace through the first conversion, it would follow that he himself was already converted and then turned away.

Furthermore, since the sinner, by his first act of conversion, turns to God, there is no obstacle for him even if some slight remission of that sin follows; but mortal sins cannot be remitted one without the other; whence it is necessary that all be remitted together with the first act. The second reason is that great sinners, who habitually had been engaged in sins for a long time, would find it impossible to be converted immediately to God; since it is impossible to detest each individual sin or recall each one to memory in the briefest of times: but this is contrary to Scripture; for many

sinners, although heavily burdened with many sins, were nevertheless justified suddenly; thus it happened to Magdalen, the Thief, Paul, and especially David, who immediately said, I have sinned against the Lord, the Prophet responded, The Lord also hath carried thy sins away. 2 Kings 12 v. 13. Reason third, namely because none could be cleansed from hidden sins by a universal sorrow; but it is taught otherwise, saying: The remaining sins, which careful thought does not encounter, are understood to be included in the same confession for which one faithfully speaks with the Prophet, as stated in Chapter I. Dub. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. - Lord, cleanse me from my hidden faults. Si ergo dolor universalis valeat delere peccata occultaque, cur non deletabit praesumpta peccata non singulatim? The fourth and intrinsic reason is this: (as Father Suarez teaches well), when one grieves over his own sins for a universal reason, which is opposed to every sin, then virtually he detests each of his own particular sins; for that act of grief extends both to all and to each individually. And this reason is that in the movement of contrition suddenly, although no actual distinction can be found therein, nevertheless it is found according to which the singular sins have an order with regard to that from which there occurs in that general contrition what must be grieved, namely, the offense against God. Wherefore he adds that, who loves some community loves the individuals thereof by virtue; so too he who grieves over all sins, grieves over each individually. It does not hinder what D. 1 says when seeking whether a venial sin can be remitted without contrition; he responds: Perfect contrition is required for the remission of mortal sins, so that man actually detests the mortal sin committed to the extent that it is in him, using diligence to remember each individual mortal sin, thereby detesting each one. For Cajetan explains wisely at that place how the Saintly Doctor should be understood: "This can be understood in two ways; either that there must be as many detestations as there were sins, which would be a ridiculous assertion; or that every sin ends with its detestation; and this is the literal sense, such that in Confession, when the sinner says he has sinned a thousand times in fornication, that single act of Confession actually terminates with respect to each individual fornication; thus as regards interior acts, since a thousand fornications displease the sinner, he actually detests each one by that same one and same act." But what D. Thomas says: "Use diligence to remember: each individual mortal sin, so that each one may be detested"; this must necessarily be understood of the necessary remembrance required for Confession; for it is not well to detest.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Penitential Sacrament. Return the sins, who of them he would not carefully remember one by one, that they might be confessed; for this is evident from another text of the same Holy Doctor

cited above, where speaking about the remission of sins outside of the Sacrament, he says: But the recollection of each individual sin should either precede or at least follow justification. If therefore the recollection of individual sins can follow justification, consequently it is not necessary for the remission of those sins; but only for Confession, in which the sins should be explained with detestation individually.

Moreover, the B. Concilium prudently observed that it is fitting to meditate on the deformation of sins, so that we may more easily conceive detestation thereof; excepting nevertheless those sins of luxury, lest all be ensnared by the pernicious stench thereof and corrupt the soul adversely. He says however. Conf. 1. 1 c. i § 2 n. 5. non esse inculcandum peccatori ut specialiter doleat de peccato cui magis adhaeret ne ex inductione ad illud magis detestandum Poenitentem periculo exponat illi magis adhaendendi sed merito hanc doctrinam non esse sanam quia poenitens qui majori passioni afficitur erga aliquod peccatum nisi inducatur ad speciali illius detestationem remanente affectus radice de facili ad vomitum redibit. Question. V.quia poenitens, qui majori passione afficitur erga aliquod peccatum, nisi inducatur ad specialis illius detestationem, remanente affectus radice, de facili ad vomitum redibit.

In order to obtain grace in the Sacrament of Penance besides sorrow, an explicit presumed act of faith and hope is required? They affirm Concina, page 166, note 30. Hurt. d. 6 diff. 8 et Torres de Fide d. 32 dub. 3 et alii, quia ex fidentes Deum sibi propter Christum propitium fore. They, however, deny this according to Bon. d. 3 in praec. 1 q. 2 p. 2 n. 9. . 8 c. 7 q. 6 et Escob. 1. 14 n. ro3 with Fill. and Mald., because, as they say, no sufficient reason is proved for requiring the act of faith and hope explicitly in the confession. Escob. and Lug. rightly say (optimaliter conciliando sententias), that when one approaches Confession truly penitent, an accessory elicited explicitly is thereby elicited (non already reflexively, but qui- Cap. I.

Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 541 decidedly exercised) act of faith and hope; for when it contributes to receiving the remission of its own sins, beyond doubt it explicitly presumes that by virtue of the Sacrament it is to be remitted to itself, and explicitly hopes through the Sacrament that God will remit to it its sins on account of the merits of Christ. Question. VI.

An contrition is required to be received according to the rite 44th penance, or whether sufficiency is provided by attrition? It is certain and common among the Doctors that perfect contrition is not required, but suffices attrition. A great question is, whether attrition suffices without an

implanted love; which arises from charity prevailing, even though remitted? The first opinion denies this, and Juvenin holds this view; from the Second Decretum, Fourth Book, Number Two, Sections One and Two. Perhaps. p. 38.

Cons. 3. Morin. lib. 8 c. 4 n. 2. Habert de poenit. c. 4 § 4. Antoine p. 5oo. 9 p. 68 ex n. 1 cum aliis. The reasons for this judgment will be apparent from the objections to the second judgment, which we follow.

The second opinion is nearly common, and this are maintained by Canus Gonet in tom. 4 p. 103 who asserts that more illustrious ones among the ancient Theologians adhered to this; likewise in tom. 9 p. 126 q. 2. Wigandt. tr. 13 n. 44. Cabass. The. J. c. 6 ex n. 11 cum Val.

Viguer. . 15 s. 14 n. 12. 2. Abelly c. 5 s. 10 (as common he says) Lugo d. 7 n. 273 (who says, contrary to Anacl. page 505 number 47. c. 4 q. 1. . 3 art. 3 n. 7 and Croix ex n. 873 with innumerable others. They say that sufficiency is found in attrition which arises from a motive that is honest and supernatural, namely from fear of hell; or from omission of eternal beatitude, or from consideration of the turpitude of sin under the light of faith known, not however without some initial love of God, lacking that which is pre-eminent. This opinion openly favors it. Article 4, section 1, where, after having said, he states through the salt, section 47, Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: the forgiven sin is remitted through contrition before absolution; it adds: Sometimes it happens that something contrary to perfect contrition obtains due to the force of habitual virtues. Therefore, the Holy Doctor distinguishes thus (as we shall see shortly), namely between perfect contrition which justifies outside the Sacrament, and imperfect contrition which justifies in the Sacrament; this latter must not be understood otherwise than as attrition, congruent to it is understood, and called from Prov. 1 ex eodem 4 where it says: It teaches that even though perfect contrition may sometimes arise from a drink, yet it is necessary for man to be reconciled to God before this Sacrament is actually received; nevertheless, such reconciliation must not be attributed to the contrition itself without the vow of the Sacrament, which is included in that. But rather imperfect contrition, called attrition, arises either from consideration of a turpitudinous sin or from fear of hell and penances commonly; if it excludes the will to sin with hope of gain, it not only shows that one does not make a hypocrite nor more a sinner: but also declares that it is rather a presumptuous gift of God and an impulse of the Spirit of S, not yet inhabiting him, but merely moving him, by which the penitent prepares his way to contrition. Et quamvis sine Sacramento penitentiae per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat, tamen

eum ad Dei gratiam in Sacramento Penitentiae impetrandam disponit.

Adversaries object, saying that the Council (as they state for this reason, namely, that it disposes one to grace in the sacrament without charity, but is not sufficient unto grace to be received in the sacrament. But they respond according to Gonet, Man. 1. c., that this same disposition signifies and suffices, for such a disposition cannot be understood as one remote from remission, since Attrition presumed without Sacrament, insofar as it is God's gift, removes indeed what hinders the Grace, congruent with the Nativity to impetrate remission of penalty, as says the Council; therefore it must necessarily be understood of a proximate disposition. Doubt. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 343 ma to Grace to be received in the Sacrament.

And this appears fitting, as the Author of Theology observes for the utility of seminaries. And although it does not per se lead to justification without the Sacrament, etc., therefore since it leads well through the Sacrament; otherwise, if the Council had understood it solely in terms of remote disposition, it would have propounded incongruously and ineptly that attrition, although it cannot justify without the Sacrament, nevertheless disposes with the Sacrament for justification; but rather it should have said that attrition, though it does not dispose without the Sacrament for obtaining Grace, nevertheless does dispose with the Sacrament. But it is evident that here the Council of Trent speaks of a proximate disposition, since it distinguishes between two dispositions for receiving Grace, one extrinsic to the Sacrament, which is perfect contrition, of which he previously spoke, and another within the Sacrament, which is imperfect contrition, of which he subsequently speaks: Therefore, if the Council assigns perfect contrition as a proximate disposition for obtaining Grace extrinsically from the Sacrament, it likewise assigns here imperfect contrition as a proximate disposition for obtaining Grace within the Sacrament. Furthermore, the Council distinguishes between attrition outside of the Sacrament, and this it calls a gift of the Holy Spirit, preparing the way to justice; consequently, it is a remote disposition to Grace (any good act is congruent), although it does not suffice for justification; and between attrition within the Sacrament, and this it calls a disposition to receive grace in the Sacrament: therefore, it supposes this proximate disposition, otherwise it would have distinguished in vain. Moreover, contrition, which is an anguish and detestation of the soul for the committed sin, the Council of Trent says to be matter, or rather quasi-matter of this sacrament; although it divides this contrition into perfect and imperfect, yet, since both are fitting definitions of contrition and assign matter to each, it follows that presumptuous contrition imperfectly disposes proximately for the attainment of grace.

This is clearly confirmed by the same Council, the same 344. Book Six. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. c. 4, where immediately after the stated words it is subjoined: Why, then, are certain false accusations brought against Catholic writers, as if they had handed down the Sacrament of Penance as conferring grace without a good movement on the part of those receiving it.

No, rather it was not Catholic writers who were calumniated by heretics, those who said that the Sacrament of Penance confers Grace upon contrite sinners, but those who said it conferred it upon attrited ones; because they said that penitents did not possess a good will and sufficient disposition to obtain Grace in the Sacrament. Thus spoke Luther (apud 564): Sadness on account of faithlessness in sins, the loss of eternal beatitude, etc., makes one a hypocrite, nay rather more a sinner, and such are unworthy of absolution. And furthermore there he disapproved of those who call this attrition a proximate disposition to contrition. But the Holy Synod declares falsely that these writers are brought to the calumny of heretics: therefore the Council consequently approved their opinion by openly vindicating them from such calumnies. Herefore is confirmed our most holy belief.

Pope Benedict. XIV. concerning the Synod, l. 7, c. 13, ex n. 6, post Tridentinum, omnes Scholas nostram sententiam plausu excepisse. Wherefore Cardinals are not unreasonably said to have lost all probability in opposition after the Council. Hic autem advertendum est quod Alexander VII prohibuerit die 5 Maji 1667 sub excommunicatione Sedi Apostolicae reservata ne quis audeat aliquam theologica censurae, vel alterius injuriae aut contumeliae nota taxare aliam sententiam sive negentem necessitatem aliqua dilectionis Dei in attritione ex metu gehenna conceptae quae hodie inter Scholasticos communius videtur sive asserentem dictam necessitatem dilectionis. However, this Decree does not prohibit calling one's own opinion true or certain; rather, Lugo states in De Fide, d. 20, n. 104.

Cardinal. in I Crisi d. 9 n. 297. Croix with VIII. n. 33. Book I. Dub. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 545 at the end and v. I said that it is not prohibited to call the opposite improbable and false, because improbability and falsity are not theological censures. Moreover, the Pontiff, by saying that he denies the necessity of love in contrition being common among scholastics, seems (as P. appropriately notes) not only to have tolerated it, but somehow to have approved it; indeed, he undoubtedly gave it great weight; for it was a matter concerning the value of the Sacrament and

Alexander testifies that scholastics received it more commonly as morally certain; no one fails to see that in matters of Sacraments it is illicit to follow an opinion which is neither safer nor morally certain: At least, if the Pontiff had intended otherwise, he would have given a great handle for error in such a serious matter and concerning what is proximate to this Sacrament, from which so many souls depend on salvation. It is proved in two ways, because the Sacraments effect and actually produce what they signify; since however this Sacrament, by Christ's institution, is a Sacrament of the Dead, and per se has the power to confer grace primarily, it must be (as teaches D.) that the Priest absolving the Penitent shows him as not only signifi-catively but also effectively absolved; namely, so that when he himself pronounces the form of absolution, those words not only signify but actually effect the remission of sin. Hence we say that, if attrition is not sufficient for remission, and contrition which justifies the man outside of the Sacrament is required, all penitents should be justified and access this Sacrament.

It does not hinder to say that even if penitents who are always justified should accede to this Sacrament, the sins would always be remitted by the keys, since Tridentine teaching shows that perfect contrition does not justify without the vow of the Sacrament (understand explicitly or implicitly); For it is replied that, if this were the case, the 546th lib. would respond differently. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. The Sacrament of Penance would never be verified, that the Sacrament of Penance actually effects what it signifies, namely the forgiveness of sins.

Furthermore, it is answered from c. si Presbyter, 12. te c. Agnovimus. 13., therefore the Pontiffs suppose that, should a dying person have made a vow of the Sacrament and be disposed for absolution, yet on account of his negation he would be condemned; hence absolution actually remits sins. 4.1 This, however, their adversaries do not deny in fact, but they say (and significantly q. 5 art. 1) that sin outside the Sacrament is remitted only through perfect contrition, namely which arises from intense charity, and not through contrition which arises from remitted charity, or through attrition arising from an inchoate love, which although it may be predominant, is nevertheless remitted. But it is replied that every pain which arises from charity predominant in love constitutes justification outside the Sacrament, as commonly taught by the Doctors cited, according to D. 3 thus he says: Contrition, as often said (q. 1 art. 2 ad 1 and q. 3 et 4 art. 1), has a twofold pain; one is of reason, which is displeasure at the sin committed, and this can be so slight that it does not suffice for the notion of contrition, as if the sin displeased him less than its separation from the end should; even an abundant love may be so remissed that it does not suffice for the notion of charity; another pain is

in sense, and the littleness of this does not hinder the notion of contrition; because it does not itself pertain to contrition, but rather is joined to it as from an accident; and again it is not in our power. Then he concludes thus: Therefore, it must be said that however small the pain may be, so long as it suffices for the reason of contrition, it erases all guilt. Therefore from that; but those who have contrition arising from preponderant charity, already more Chapter I. Doubt.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. The displeasing sin is repugnant because it is a separation from the end; therefore, remission of sin follows here already. It does not hinder to say that the Holy Doctor speaks here of the required sorrow in the Sacrament of Penance; for although he speaks here of the parts of this Sacrament, nevertheless, speaking generally of contrition, he speaks as a virtue, just as authors do who speak of required sorrow for the Sacrament of Penance, thereby presumptuously speaking of contrition in general. Wherefore St. Thomas there proposes the question, whether a slight contrition is sufficient for the remission of greater sins? And hence he resolves: Every contrition is a grace-forming grace-making; therefore whatever it may be, it erases all guilt.

Herein the Saintly Doctor does not utter a single word concerning the Sacrament of Penance; why then is his doctrine confined to contrition in the Sacrament? Then, what he himself says regarding contrition in general is evident from the questions which he previously proposes, namely: Is contrition a sorrow taken for sins with the proposition of confessing them? Whether it is an act of virtue? Whether contrition should be with regard to the original sin? Whether the entire life is a time for contrition.

Do the punishments of another life crush the sins of the soul? These Doubts cannot be reduced to contrition so as to use them as matter for the Sacrament. Furthermore, it is required for true penance that the sin be removed, because it is contrary to God's supreme and universal love. Moreover, from the aforementioned text in Quod I. 4 art. 1 (as we have reported), it is stated that through mere contrition the sin is remitted; but if before absolution this Sacrament be had in vow, then already the virtue of the keys operates therein and brings about the remission of guilt. Therefore always when the holy Doctor speaks of pain, which pertains to the reason of contrition, he always understands that through it the penalty is remitted by the sacrament itself.

That any contrition arising from charity predominant, although forgiven and erased, proves the remission of the sin is established in §48 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. 1 from the Council of Trent, from the same, chapter 4, session 14, where it is said: Although this

contrition sometimes may be perfectly charitable and reconcile a man to God before this Sacrament is actually received, etc., therefore perfect charity already justifies the sinner before the reception of the Sacrament.

Nevertheless, adversaries read contrition as not perfectly perfect charity, but as Perfect Love, from which they infer that the Council is speaking of intense charity. But I speak of charity perfect. And thus it seems more plausible to read it this way, for Tò regards properly perfect charity, but contrition, since here the Council divides contrition into perfect and imperfect, as is apparent to the reader. But, it does not follow that Tò would look at charity perfectly, rather than contrition, since the Council requires for justification outside of Sacrament a strong charity; for even though predominant charity, although remitted, is presumed to be perfect charity, which is nonetheless more intense; perfection or imperfection of charity, as well said by 74, is not taken from intensity or remission, but from the reason why it arises: hence perfect charity arises from the reason of the goodness of God, whereas imperfect charity arises from the reason of good to be obtained from God. Therefore, if the Council had said charitatem, not charitate, undoubtedly it would have called perfect charity for distinction from imperfect or inchoate, which as we shall say below, does not reach to predominant charity.

Hence Faculty of T. 9p. 95 condemned this Proposition: By contrition alone, without recourse to the actual Sacrament, a sin is not remitted outside the sum of Martyrdom or Necessity. Item Clerus Gallicanus in Comitiis Generalibus anno 1700. (apud eundem.) Tourn. p. 102) declared: These two things are to be both admonished and taught from the Holy Council of Trent: first, that no one think it necessary in the Sacrament to have previously that contrition which is perfect charity, and which reconciles man with God before it is received. Likewise, the Faculty of Paris noted the censure of a book by certain Claudii Seguenotii in the year 1638, saying: What the Author presents regarding the insufficient attrition, Chapter I. Dub.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 34g knowledge, and contrition from the necessity of perfect charity absolutely required for receiving the Sacrament of Penance; and what adds to this concerning absolution, that there is nothing other than a declaration of the sin already remitted, the Faculty condemned it, and decreed those Propositions to be contrary to the practice of the Church, diminishing the efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance, and furthermore temerarious and erroneous. That is to say, because every contrition deletes sins, it is proved that the act of contrition is a formal act of charity toward God, or intrinsically united with charity, as commonly taught by Bonaventure. Scoto, 6 p. 2 n. 727 cum Lugo,

Aversa, Bosco, et Gorm ex D. Nec videtur de hoc posse dubitari; nam peregregie loquitur P. 534 dicens: "quod in substantia contritionis non sit imperfectus charitas, utraque enim tendit ad Deum, sed diverso modo: charitas tendit ad Deum per modum consecutionis, ut summum Bonum; contritio vero per modum fugae, quatenus homo detestatur peccatum, ut summum malum, ut potè Deo oppositum." Charitas tendit immediate in Deum, et mediate in odium peccati; contritio autem immediate in odium peccati, et mediate in amorem Dei.

Wherefore concludes that contrition is an act formally of charity, since on account of God's love man hates sin. Furthermore, since contrition arises solely from a motive of charity, contrition cannot exist unless preceded and simultaneously coexistent with charity; for contrition is nothing other than pain over sin, insofar as it offends the supreme beloved God; hence whoever is contrite must necessarily exercise, even if not reflexively, an act elicited by charity, and thus St. Thomas in the third part, question 85, article 6, said: "The act and habit of charity are simultaneous with the act and habit of penance in time." Therefore, given that contrition is a presumed true charity, or necessarily connected with charity, it necessarily must be presumed that it remits sin. It is less clearly apparent from Divine Scriptures that he who loves God is already a partaker in the friendship of God, as stated in Proverbs 8. I love those who love Me.

Ioannes 14. He who loves Me, will be loved by My Father. 1. Of Peter 4. Caritas覆掩多罪数。 Joan. 4.

Every one who loves is born of God. Hence D. Augustine, (tr. 9. in Joann.) said: Fear is a medicine, charity is health. And 1 against 2. Letter. Charitas fecit filium de Deo: non video, ama, et habes.

And in John 9, acting out of charity, he says: "He who has this treasure will have the Holy Spirit." Saint Thomas teaches more openly in his Second Part of the Second Commentary, Question 45, Article 4, where he says: Charity... cannot be present with mortal sin. And it is evident that the aforementioned Doctor does not speak here of intense charity, but solely of predominant charity, because himself in question 24 article 12 to which he refers, where he says: "Every act of mortal sin is contrary to charity according to its proper reason, which consists in this, that God must be loved above all." Whereby P. Concina says unworthily that the Saintly Doctor understands that such charity cannot be with sin, which is intense in degree, since St. Thomas says in Amor that it can be so remitted as not to suffice for the reason of charity. For it is answered that, since here this does not yet reach the object of charity, namely, does not yet love God above all things, this is not true charity, but the beginning of charity; but if

it suffices for the reason of charity, which consists in loving God above all things (as the doctor explained in q. 24 art. 12 where he said: Every act of mortal sin contravenes charity according to its proper reason, which consists in this, that God is to be loved above all), then whatever it may be remitted, it is true charity, and this he says cannot be with mortal sin.

Et ratio evidens est, quia congruent quaecumque aversio a Deo tamquam a fine ultimo, praesumptum in gradu remisso, sufficit ad amittendam Dei amicitiam; ita quaecumque vera conversio sufficit ad eam recuperandam, ex illo: Convertimini ad me; et "Cap. I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. Let me turn to you. Zach. 1.

And otherwise: The impiety of the wicked will not harm him, on whatever day he may turn. Ezech. 33. Whereupon Bellarmin says in his book IV, page 347: The act of love toward God opposes everything to sin and effectively expels it; hence without a miracle sin cannot remain after the act of love toward God. Michaelis Baji, condenada por Gregorius XIII, qui dixit: Haec caritas, quae est plenitudo legis, non semper est conjuncta cum remissione peccatorum. It is certain among all, that charity required to fulfill the law should not be intense, but sufficient, if it reaches, to love God above all things.

Whatever it may say in To. 6 p. 333, requiring intense charity to fulfill the precept of love, from that: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart," etc. Nevertheless, Theologians commonly hold the opposite view according to 2. quaest. 44 art. 8 ad 2., who explaining how this is to be understood says; When it is commanded that we love God with all our heart, it should be understood that we must love God above all things. And ibid., q. 24 n. 8, says: Ad veram charitatem satis est, quod habitualiter quis ponat totum cor suum in Deum, ita scilicet ut nihil cogitet vel velit quod Divinae dilectioni sit contrarium; et haec perfectio communis est omnibus qui charitatem habent. Therefore, the perfection of charity consists in this, that man love God above all things, and will nothing that is contrary to divine affection; as is evident from that [text] 1. Joh. 2. 5. Qui servat verbum Christi (scilicet legem implet), vere in hoc perfecta est charitas Dei.

Hence it is certain that charity, although remitted, prevails to fulfill the law, as commonly stated in . 7. 2 c. 3 and 5. Bonaventura in the first preceding question of the third distinction, fourth quodlibet, first part, number two, with Valerius and v. I distinguish, for although it is itself contrary to the sufficiency of attrition, this does not negate the fact that remitted charity, if predominant, is sufficient for the fulfillment of a precept, provided that no command exists otherwise. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, then (as he says), concerning the intensity of charity; for otherwise God would command what is impossible, since it is not within our power to have intense charity; unless you wish to say with the Continuator. Turnately to. 3 p. 271. vers. Before, and more clearly, p. 273. vers. Neither he who has love of God prevailing, necessarily has a presumptuous intense (rational, not yet sensitive) love prevailing, which suffices well to fulfill the precept.

But the intensity of love is to be understood in such a way that the question is one merely of the name. Contra然而你的句子中包含了一个错误，"contra" 在这里不应该使用。正确的翻译应该是： Otherwise certainly he fulfills the precept who has charity appetitively predominant. And this charity Bajus said could be compatible with sin, and this has been condemned.

Bajus however asserted: That charity, which is the fulness of the law, is not always joined with the remission of sins. Therefore, as my most illustrious and learned Bishop Tornus says correctly, the opposite position must be held: namely, that charity, which fulfills the law, is always conjunct with the remission of sins. It does not hinder to say that the proposition has been proscribed with regard to habitual charity, namely when one is in grace, but not with regard to actual charity: for well responds Lugd. d. 5 n. 101, that Bajus was speaking of charity which is the plenitude of the law, of which the Apostle speaks in Romans 13. Hence there is no doubt that Bajus spoke not of the habit of charity or of justifying grace, but of the act of love; for the law is not fulfilled by mere habit, but by an act, since the law does not prescribe a habit, but the act of charity, as commonly said by the Doctors: because a habit does not fall under a precept, and precepts are not fulfilled except through acts. This is confirmed by Proposition 70 condemned by the same Bajus, which said: A man existing in mortal sin... can have true charity; and charity itself also appears capable of enduring withstanding eternal damnation.

Bajus igitur hic distinguiebat charitatem veram a perfecta; pertinet etiam perfecta (nota sedulo illud additum etiam) utique intelligebat charitatem intensam; et per hoc veram, charitatem Cap. I. Dub., II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 35 The remission, which without doubt is true charity, since greater and lesser do not vary the species; and both parts of the Proposition are condemned. I know not how to respond to these. From all these things collected together it is evident that the oppositional contention, which states that contrition with remitted charity does not justify outside of the Sacrament, is altogether improbable and false; hence Lugo in d. 5 n. 99 rejects it commonly among all Theologians, n. 115 even

more so.

Coninch. denomina erroneam, Vasq. contra sententiam Catholicam, Alphonsus Curiel parum tutam in fide, alii vero temerariam et scandalosam: temerariam, quia in re gravissima discedit ab omnibus Theologis et communis sensus SS. Fathers: But scandalous, because it removes men from frequently seeking contrition. And thus Gonet testifies d. 3 n. 27, that Sylvius, although he had previously defended an opposed opinion with caution, could so thoroughly retract it: Because (says Gonet) such a doctrine openly contradicts various Scriptures and councils, as well as the Saints. Testimonies of the Fathers. They object, however, I. against our opinion regarding the sufficiency of attrition: A sinner, being turned away from God, cannot be converted to God except through formal and actual charity.

Response: Hoc vero requiritur extra Sacramentum, et ratio est, quia per peccatum, quod est actualis contemptus Dei, homo avertitur a Deo; ita per amorem actualem debet se ad Deum convertire. Another thing to be said about the remission of sins within the Sacrament, because, since the Sacrament has the power of removing sin, and this can occur only through the infusion of grace, which is itself habitual charity, it suffices for obtaining grace so that the sinner may be disposed to receive the Sacrament by attrition, with the virtue whereby he is converted to God without actual charity, as he would be converted outside the Sacrament by charity. And thus is understood how the sinner from attrition becomes contrite, namely because he is made equivalent to one contrite through the virtue of the keys, as stated by Thomas, V. 354 Lib. VI. Et sic intelligitur, quomodo peccator ex attrito fiat contritus, nempe quia virtute clavium aequivalenter contritus redditur, prout dicitur Di- Tom, V. 354 Lib. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament. Supporters of our opinion commonly find favor, from St. Thomas in the cited passage. That which he taught in book 4, article 1: Some do not acquire the contribution of clavial grace by the virtue of perfect obedience. They object II.

He who grieves over sin on account of the punishment, hates the punishment more than the sin; hence, if he does not have charity, he cannot obtain the grace of God. Response is given by distinguishing: Qui magis actu odisset poenam quam culpam ex timore, qui dicitur serviliter servilis, adeo ut ille peccare vellet si non esset puniendus; hic non solum eliceret actum bonum ex suo dolore, sed positivè malum, quia non excluderet à suo dolore voluntatem peccandi. Whoever hates culpability on account of punishment, and excludes altogether the will to sin, feels

that he has offended God out of fear of Hell; this one already elicits an act of good, which arises from ordered charity toward himself (as declared by Trent, and confirmed by Alexander VIII by condemning Proposition 15 which stated: 'A contrition born of fear of hell without love for God's benevolence is not a good and supernatural movement'); and thus he is already disposed to receive grace in the sacrament to be obtained. They object III. To whatever justification absolutely requires as a principle at least the beginning of love; as the Council of Trent declared in session 4, chapter 6, where it said that sinners, while being disposed for justification, begin to love God... as the source of all justice, and consequently are moved against sins through hatred of some kind, and detestation.

It is replied: We do not deny that for justification an initial principle of love is required; nor do we deny what is presumed in the Sacraments of the dead, since the Council there speaks especially about justification through Baptism. But what kind of love, I beg you, does the Council require? Is charity then perfect? Or is it merely the beginning of charity? This refers to averting that which is attested in canon 8 chapter 13 namely that some Fathers of the Council, instead of diligently loving, began to contend, so that something might be added through an act of charity: but this Council restored and confirmed it, setting forth "Cap: I." Dub.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. "355 return solely to loving. They begin." Why is it restored? Unless it has judged, so that it is not required for justification in Baptism (or in the Sacrament of Penance, for these Sacraments proceed pari passu), the act of perfect charity. This however is the beginning of love, as well Gammach teaches in his third part on penance, chapter nine.

Frassen: to. 10 p. 563 qu. 2. Petrocorens. tom. 4 p. 114 quæst. 3. et Tourn. Prel. Theol. tom. 9 p. 126; it is now found in attrition, as described above: A punishment through fear of divine vengeance, according to Ecclesiasticus 25:16. Thirdly, through hope of eternal beatitude, as D. Thomas teaches in I, 2, qu. 40, art. 7, when speaking of theological hope, he calls it indeed the beginning of love towards God, thus saying: "eam esse quidem initium amoris erga Deum"?

From this... that which we hope to be able to come about through another, we are moved; in the very thing itself, it is congruent with our good, and thus we begin to love it in itself. Whereupon the same Sacred Doctor in II. II quæst. 17. art. 8 says: "Perfect love is that whereby someone is loved according to himself... imperfect love is that whereby one loves something... but so that some good may thereby accrue to himself." These things however (as the aforementioned authors say, and explain)

necessarily concur in attrition, since he who with those and the hope of forgiveness approaches the Sacrament begins to love God as His liberator, justifier, and glorifier. Nor is it an obstacle to say that he who loves God for the sake of a good thing which is his own, loves himself and not God; for wisely does he respond. Saint Francis de Sales in chapter 17 of his treatise on the love of God states: "Si quis diligeret Deum propter suum bonum et ita affectus esset, ut si,"

He who hoped nothing from God would in no way love Him; this man would indeed sin, because he positively excluded charity; for then he would not turn to God but rather more strongly turn away from Him, since he pervertedly ordered God to himself as the ultimate end. Whoever, however, loves: God as his supreme good, and thereby excludes [something]; Lib. 356. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, at that time an elicited act of a supernatural good will be sought with all one's will; although it does not have perfect charity, nevertheless it does not exclude that, and already begins to possess it, and in some way turns itself toward God. However, who would deny that it is altogether expedient for penitents to strive according to their powers to elicit an act of perfect contrition, and that confessors always study to excite them to this, so that they may securely obtain divine grace? But our opinion is that, if anyone approaches with mere attrition, he should not be refused this Sacrament; and the Confessor should not reject him as unfit. - 43 - Question VII. Whether in Confession it is sufficient that there be attrition from fear of temporal punishments as they are inflicted by God? The first opinion affirms this; and this is held by Lugo, Distinction 5, note 137. . 15. Alexander.

VIII. n. 12. . 59. qui cum Mojo, Aversa, etc., cum Groix n. 884, qui vocat probabilissimam. Reason, because among four motives of attrition to a Sacrament sufficient he says, from fear of hell and punishments: where by hell is understood eternal punishment, but by punishments seems to be understood temporal punishment, since in that Council an example of Ninive’s repentance is adduced; which was conceived out of fear for the destruction of its city; for God threatens eternal punishments accordingly, just as He spares temporal punishments from sinners who have been turned away. The second opinion denies this, and this is held by Concina, page 236, note 11. Canus Pasqualigo apud 9. Resol. 51.

And n. 72. doubt, whether the first judgment is morally certain. Reason, because although Trent says from fear of hell and of punishments, yet it does not distinguish between hell or punishments; hence both are probably understood in the same way; for the punishment of a mortal sin is eternal,

therefore one who repents of an eternal evil should fear it. The first proposition seems more probable; for hell embraces all. I, Dub. H.

Regarding the age: Of this Sacrament. 35g pternea penea; and therefore, according to Coniole, and pindarum, something else; besides the penance sternly interdicted is to be understood. When, however, the second does not possess its own probative force, at least extrinsically, I think it safer to adhere to it in practice. It is questioned VIII. Whether it can be given a valid and inefficacious Sacrament of Penance? The cause would be if one had committed two mortal sins, one a theft, and another perjury; then he confesses only my own theft, repenting not from a universal motive but from a special motive of supernatural turpitude which inheres in theft; it is questioned whether here, although grace is not rightly received, nevertheless validly he confesses; the obstacle removed, it may always detest sin by death, and the obstacle removed, it may always detest sin by obit, so that it can be an occasion for causing grace, but there cannot be an obligation to repeat a sin already confessed, but only what has been omitted for causing grace, but only what has been omitted?

The first opinion denies, and this is held by Elbati n. 82. Felix; He can, according to Scotus, be Bosco; Sperer; Mysterio, Gallensis, and Scotiis; Commonly likewise. Wandering. From these authorities, some (like Vagus) say. It is possible; and they say, such a thing.

If the sacrament is to be considered valid, it must be formed, that is, caused by the intention and for the reason of grace. Reason, because, when a potent one suffers pain and desires to obtain divine friendship, although he suffers from a special movement of turpitude of theft, yet his suffering tends to be a virtue for another if a small mortality is absent; suppose, having been potentiated in reconciliation with God; and therefore, if he suffers detraction from what specifies, he should delete another of the same genus, which such a king would do; hindrance is prevented. Others however (Holzmann, etc.) say, such a thing! The sacrament would be not only informal but presumptuously invalid. Ratio, quia in Trident. hajda Sacramenti. quatenus operatum. animasipem: pece- torum; igitur, si dolor ille particulares remissionem non causat, numquam erit materia apta ad Sacramentum, ac proinde Sacramentum erit semper invalidum. If any opinion is more probable, and if they draw from Ingaidit 14 ex n.65 Sar. d. 2aest. 4n.26. itantale. §58 Lk.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. Val.& Gonet, d. 10 art.: cum aliis: Thomini communis-aimè, ex quibus gart. 1 et in IV dist. 4q qu. 3 art. 4 Question 1 cujus verba retulimus n. 87.

For indeed AA. say, such a penitent does not receive grace, who on one side cannot return from one mortal sin without another; and on the other hand, when a sinner feels remorse only for the particular reason of turpitude of theft, he cannot wash away remission of perjury, which neither grieves nor regrets. They nevertheless say that the Sacrament is valid, because no part is lacking; it rains to be a whole. Not Confession, when their memory of sins is made complete: not sorrow, since sorrow already exists concerning the confessed sin, nor absolution, which is assumed; hence nothing prevents such a Sacrament from being said to be valid. To the first objection, it is replied that the virtual pain, which is supposed to be included in the death of the perjury (by the specific detestation of the confessed theft), is not sufficient matter for the Sacrament, since in no way can a sensible pain arise either through Confession or any other means. Regarding the second objection, it is responded that the Council discusses what is inherent and grounded in essence, not what is accidental and happens by chance. Moreover, a greater counsel is that pain be alleviated from a general reason; nay, it is necessary, although: man can possibly have in his soul other mortal sins forgotten. 1. i. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. §59 Quaeritur IX.

An actus doloris debet praetendere quod solum absolutionem; sed praesumptum Confessionem prima sententia affirmat, et hanc tenent Laym: c. 4 n. 3i: ., 7 n. 1: item:: pag: n32 n: 3: Rabib., tpm: quia dolor tam quam natura: hujus Sacramenti debet esse sensibiles, nec aliis, nisi per Confessionem, sensibilis efficitur; ergo, si Confessionem subsequitur, non est materia apta tum qui et Cen fessi: non debet esse simplex narratio, sed arcusatio falsissima directa ad habitationem per alibitineatum et ideo oportet ut si a dolor in Cup. I. Doubt. II. On the essence, of this Sacrament. 359. 30.

Iugo distinction 15 page 13 line 22. 508 item Doctorate. Major. Henry cites. He thinks probable and will perform the Rite Roman, of the probable he thinks, will perform Rite Roman, of. Sacramentum poenitentiæ dicens: Audita, Confessione (Confessarius) ad dolorem efficacibus verbis adducere conābitur, etc. Ex hoc videtur Rituale supponere quod subiciat dolor post Confessionem elicitus. But they rightly say.

Salm: treatise, chapter 6, concerning which Suarez and Dicaqtilius explain, does not differ from the first; for Layman, Conqinchins, and Palaus demand nothing else than that Confession should not be a mere narration of sins, but an accusation against oneself, for the obtaining of absolution. According to the words of Layman, whom follows Palaus; It is required that sorrow somehow precede confession, and that external confession of

sins proceed from internal penance, signifying this; forasmuch as the matter of Sacred Majesties is not a mere explanation of sins, but an accusation against itself tending to absolution, as Coninch explains. Then Layman himself, following the opinion above, adds: For this reason (namely, that Confession may be sacramental) it is necessary that after the narration of sins, a habit of sorrow of the soul be declared somehow by some sign, as if seasoning with salt, before the priest, seeking or expecting absolution; such a sign has relation to the sins somewhat previously explained and gives the true reason for the sacrament of accusation. Therefore these sentiments are not two, but one; inasmuch as Layman, together with others, requires that Confession be sorrowful, and that pain precede Confession, insofar as it is demanded that Confession not be a mere narration of sins, but have the reason of sacramental accusation; and for this suffices that Confession become an obtaining of absolution from the heart, and then pain be manifested, at least through petition or expectation of absolution; thus indeed Confession becomes sacramental. They add moreover, Book 560, Chapter.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. The Salmanticenses state that confessors usually resort to this practice solely to alleviate superficial scruples; if they doubt the internal disposition of the penitent regarding sins previously explained, they prompt him to grieve over those sins just expounded, which occurs when one says: "I grieve for the sins you have narrated and accuse myself." Question X. 448

For how much time-space the act of sorrow shall endure morally in order to validly receive the Sacrament: according to number 29 of lib. 14 Eseob. and with Soto, Hurtado, and Candido it is held that a sufficient sorrow is that which preceded Confession by a long time, provided that it has not been withdrawn. But these are not approved rightly by the PP. Concil. on page 233 n. 4. Others, however, as Cardinal Cajetan states in his proposition i. Innoc. XI. p. 65: n. 88. 14 R. 67 cum Præp. et Gran dicunt sufficere dolorem præcedentem per unum diem modo fuerit elicitus in ordine ad Confessionem: cum enim Confessio sit effectus illius doloris dolor virtualiter perseverat.

This however seems rather to be a counsel to follow than a precept, since the Doctors with Peter the Consistorial advocate some analogy between the civil forum and the sacramental; whence there can be some interval between the discussion of the cause and the sentence, but not so great as in the civil forum. 447 Question XI. Whether, in order that sorrow may be matter adequate [aptum], it should be elicited with the intention of Confession? They deny it Lugo dist. 14 n. 37 item Sporer, Moya, 1. 1 c. 2. The reason is, firstly because according to 14 cap. 4 that attrition is said to

dispose for obtaining grace in the Sacrament, which same attrition is said to dispose for obtaining grace in the Sacrament, which excludes the will to sin, as it excludes the will to sin, as commanded by the Epistle. I.

Doubt. II. On the essence of that Sacrament. 361 hope of forgiveness, which validates all in our case. Then, because then pain, although it was not ordered to Confession in an antecedent relation, is nevertheless ordered to a consequent relation, since then still it is verified that suffering pain through Confession brings about forgiveness. They affirm however, Concilium 1.c., (this is presumed for this proposition by P. Suarez dist. 20 a. 4 n. 29, but Lugo loc. cit. shows that .) Reason, because, congruent minister or presumptively receiving other Sacraments ought to originate the matter of the Sacrament through intention, as for ablution in Baptism, or touch of material in Ordination, so too a presumptively receiving minister of Penance ought to ordain the pain which is the matter of this Sacrament.

The first opinion is more probable; but since the second opinion is also probable prior to the reception of the Sacrament, Innocence teaches that it is safeguarded. XI. hand to follow operate. It is asked about XII. Whether, if anyone immediately after absolution confesses a forgotten sin, he is bound to experience anew the pain of contrition? The first opinion, more common, denies this, and this is held by Lugo, Distinction 14, note 27.

Anacl. num. 73. . 3 art. 3 n. 8 cum Perez, Sporer nu. 300. . 214 nu. 75 putat probabilissimam cum . Reason, because the prior sorrow extends its presumption to forgotten sins, which while immediately repentant confesses them, makes them one morally; for rightly one proximate material part can constitute several Sacraments; hence it is congruent that with one water many Baptisms can be made, just as with one sorrow, which still persists, many can be constituted Penitential Sacraments. (as this is supposed here) The second opinion affirms, and this holding is found at 5 n. 10. Son. ed. 6 n. 77. Reason, because through the first absolution the judgment has already been completed i, therefore if it is to be imparted §62 Lib.

VI. Treat. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. For a new absolution, a new proximate matter is required. And although sorrow in itself morally perseveres, nevertheless it does not persevere in relation to the second absolution; for, as we have said above in the preceding Question.

X. The probabilitas ad valorem of the Sacrament requires that the pain not merely be elicited, but presumed to be elicited in order to achieve

absolution. Since therefore this second opinion is probable: more probable, in practice altogether to be followed, say Croix n. 712 and Conc. pag. 234 n. 5 at least as safer I consider tenetdam. Quæritur XIII. How is the pain to be elicited in the confession of venial sins? It is certain that, although outside the Sacrament some grace or charity may suffice for its remission, yet it grieves D. 2. Concilium paginis 235 n. 6 et Croix nu. 682 (contra paucos) ex Decretis Augustini.

Epist. 48, ubi scripsit: Nec quemquam plites, a quocumque vel magno vel parvo peccato ad correctionem sine paenitentia posse transire. But it is doubted: whether to confess a venial sin without any sorrow at all can be mortal? Natalis Alex negat: de Pœnit. art. 7 reg. 20 p. mihi 69. Penit. q. 4 § 2 et Genettus t. 4 q. 8 in fine p. 81 et dicunt, non esse, nisi veniale, discere Sacramendum sine certo dolore, quando materia tantum levis affertur in Confessione, et abest animus profanandi Sacramentum: quia, ut supponuit, frustrave Sacramendum in materia levi, non est nisi levis irreverentia. But having been assailed with a flood of opinion in favor of this view, he could not acquiesce, since this sentiment is opposed to common Theology, as can be seen according to Croix n. 683.

Antoine page 50: q. 7. and Lugo dist. 14 sect. 8 n. 136. Whoever calls the first opinion entirely false, and the reason is excessively pressing, for in this case all malice consists in culpability, which is incurred through the Sacrament, frustrating its effect: either therefore the Sacrament will be frustrated by a serious matter, or by a trivial one, it makes no difference, because irreverence towards the Sacrament is always involved. Chapter I. Dub. II.

Be. The essence of this Sacrament. 563 Doubt 2: whether in Confession it is sufficient to grieve over one venial sin without another? Some deny the contrary to what is commonly held, which is taught by c. Lug. dis. 14 n. 118 with Henry and 14 n. 166 cum cum venial sins are not necessary matter, but only sufficient. They say however from Lugo ex n. 133. Too. I. 1 c. 3 n. 9 et 10. . 11 gio, sub ficere praesumptum, si quis dollet de multitudine, aut frequens ha venialium etsi non doleat de singulis in particulari, quia, ut dicunt, congruent quis potest dolere de excessu distractionis in precibus, vel domestici, ita de multitudine venialium.

And it seems that D. favors where he says that a sufficient purpose prepares one for many venial sins. Therefore, it is sufficient to feel sorrow for the multitude itself; for a purposeful intention follows from sorrow. However, Arriaga and Dicast. at Croix I c. say that both the pain and the purpose should not merely be concerning the multitude to be amended, but presumptuous regarding the very venial sins themselves, which agree

with frequency. But it seems that these opinions can easily be reconciled; for it is impossible to grieve over a multitude and not at least grieve about those posterior sins through which the multitude is constituted, because this circumstance makes the excess an abstraction from the sins themselves: then you would grieve at least obliquely of the sins, directly and principally of the excess. Rightly presumptuous is it for Croix n. 913 to say concerning semi-deliberates that one should suffice in grieving; what has been committed and subsequently desires to attend to the very things to be avoided, as much as human charity permits.

And these things are according to the doctrine of question 87 article 1 ad 3, where it is said: Penitence with regard to mortal sins retains what a man proposes to abstain from where it is required for all and for each...but where penance for venial sins is required, it retains what a man proposes to abstain from according to §62 of the Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. For a new absolution, a new proximate matter is required.

And although sorrow in itself morally perseveres, nevertheless it does not persevere in relation to the second absolution; for, as we have said above in the preceding Question. X. Probabiliter biliter ad valorem Sacramenti irrequiritur ut dolor non solum sit elicitus, sed praesumptivus elicitus in ordine ad absolutionem. Since therefore this second opinion is probable, and more probable, in practice altogether to be followed they say Croix n. 7 in et Conc. pag. 234 n. 5 saltem tutius censeo tenetidam. 49. It is asked XIII. How is pain to be elicited in the confession of ventials?

It is certain that, although outside the Sacrament some movement of grace or charity is sufficient for its remission, as D. teaches in 2. Conc. pag. 235 n. 6 et Croix nu. 682 (contra paucos) ex D. August. Epist. 48, ubi scripsit: Nec quemquam putes, d quocumque seu magno seu parvo peccato ad correctionem sine poenitentia posse transire. But there is doubt: whether a venial sin contained without any pain can be mortal? Natalis denies 20 to me 69.

Juehin, de Sacramento, in discere sacramentum sine certo dolore, quando materia tantum levis affertur in confessione, et abest animiis profanandi sacramentum; quia ut supponuit frustrave sacramentum in materia levi non est nisi levis irreverentia. But such a determination to acquiesce in this opinion Cohnatus could not bring himself to make, since this judgment is opposed to the common sentiment of Theologians, as can be seen according to Croix n. 683. Autone page 50t. qu. 7. et Lugo distinction 14 section 8 note 116. Whoever calls the first opinion entirely false, has a most compelling reason; for in this case the whole malice of guilt consists

in the injury inflicted upon the Sacrament; and by frustrating that which it effects in vain; therefore either if the Sacrament is frustrated, whether from grave matter or from light matter, nothing is changed, because irreverence is always shown to the Sacrament. Chapter I: Doubt.

II. Concerning the essence of this Sacrament: 363 Doubt 2: whether in a sufficient confession of venial sins one should sorrow over one sin without another? Some deny the contrary to be held with the common opinion, which are taught by c. Lug. dis. 14 n. 18 with Henry and 14 n. 66 with cum veniala non sint materia necessaria, s: d tainted sufficient: They say however Lugoex n. 133. Yes. I. 1 c. 3 n.: g et 16. : ac Sporer apud Cr. r: gio; sufa sicere praesumptum; si quis dolerat de multitudine, aut frequentia venialium; etsi non doleat de singulis in particulari quia; ut dicuit; congruent quis potest dolere de excessu distractionis in precibus, vel consentidnis, ita de multitudine venialium.

And it seems to favor D. I ad: where he says that a sufficient purpose prepares one for the commission of a venial sin. Therefore, sufficiency of sorrow is provided by the multitude thereof: for a purposeful sorrow follows from that sorrow. However, Arriaga and Dicast. according to Croix' I. c., say that both the intention and the pain should not merely be concerning the multitude to be amended; but also presumptuous regarding the very venial sin, which contributes to frequency. But these opinions seem more easily similar; for it is possible to grieve over a multitude, and not at least to grieve about posterior Alis calpis through which a multitude is constituted, because this circumstance makes an excess abstractly incapable of being separated from the sins themselves: then you would at least grieve obliquely in respect to the sins, directly and principally in respect to the excess. Croix n. q13 cam 'eic.) recte praesumptum dicit quod quisque potest dolere de veniabilibus deliberatis et proponere omnia illa vitare; de semideliberatis aut sufficiat dolere quod ea commiserit; et imposterum velit attendere ad ipsa vita da quantum humana fragilitati permittitur.

And these are, according to the doctrine; who d. qu. 87 ar. i ad r says: The punishment of venial sins has been mitigated for the dead, in that a man proposes to abstain where it is commanded by all and each; but the endurance of venial sins is borne patiently by a man, proposing to abstain from what is commanded in the 364th chapter. VI. Treatise, IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, it is given to each one individually, although not to all; for this infirmity of this life does not permit it. However, it is debated whether one should have the intention to prepare oneself for venial sins to be forgiven. § II.

Of questions pertaining to the purpose. Fourthly, it is asked first. Whether in the sacrament of Penance a virtual or implicit, included-in-the-grief purpose suffices? The first opinion denies it, and this is held by Suaricus, section two, fourth, note thirty-four. Bellarm, lib. 2. de Conc. pag. 237 n. 15, eum Scoto, Tolet Reg. Reason, because although pain necessarily includes a proposed purpose, nevertheless the Tridentine seat requires a formal purpose; you would say when the purpose is not to sin henceforth.

The second sentiment affirms this, provided that the pain be elicited from a universal motive; and they hold this, Lugo, dist. 14, n. 52. Innocence. XI. (qui moraliter certam vocat) Anacl., n. 49. 3 art. 3 n. 1, Elhel n. 87, cum Mastrio, Sporer, subdit: quod attritio, si voluntatem peccandi excludit cum spe veniae, disponat hominem ad impetrandam gratiam in Sacramento; ergo quoties has requirotur conditiones, habuerit attritio, jam sufficienter disponit ad Sacramenti valorem. The third opinion, however, which Holzmann holds on page 401. You must assert that this is common to Suarez, Bellarmine and Bona, namely, that if a penitent contemplates future life, he should formally propose amendment, because (according to Trent) each one ought to be renewed in life through penance; hence it does not seem sufficient to grieve over sins who contemplating future life explicitly does not propose himself to amend. Nor is this hindered by saying that he is a Cap. I.

Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. It will effect contrition, confession, and satisfaction; hence, if a presumptuous formal purpose were required, there would not be three parts, but four. For P. Concina responds well that contrition consists of two things, namely, sorrow and an explicit purpose. But otherwise, if the penitent thinks of nothing future, as if someone were constituted in the last state of life; for truly in any sorrow a purpose necessarily is contained, and it is evident that tacit and explicit intentions have the same efficacy.

These are rendered more probable by the last decision; yet, because the former is not devoid of its probability, in practice before the fact it is more expedient to follow the former, as rightly they say. 65. pag. 216 n. 84. cum Bellarm. Henry: quod si bona fide cum vere dolore confessus fueris sine proposito formali, non tenere te Confessionem repetere; quia, esto communius non licet Sacramentum suscipere cum opinione, qua non sit moraliter certa, ne Sacramentum exponatur periculo frustrationis; tamen non tenes repetere Confessionem; si probabiliter validus es jam confessus, cum praefatum periculum tum non amplius adsit. Nihilominus nec presumptum valeo huic sententiae acquiescere; ratio, quia cum prima opinio sit sufficienter probabilis, poenitens qui gravem culpam et certam perpetravit tenetur de ea Confessionem explere, non tantum probabiliter,

sed praesumptum certe validam. It is asked. What are the necessary conditions required for the purpose of 45?

Here above all one must advert that it is a matter extremely difficult: namely, when sinners frequently falling into mortal sins through greed and yet with a true purpose approach Confession; hence the Confessor should diligently attend to this, especially if the Penitent has had great adherence to some vice. Tres vero sunt conditiones veri propositi, scilicet ut sit firmum, universale, et efficax. I. Tres autem sunt conditiones veri propositi, nempe ut sit firmum, universale, et efficax. A firm purpose imports that the penitent have a will altogether determined not to recidivate, and - 366 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance, let his mind be so disposed that he may not desire to admit any sin in the future out of fear of some evil or from a longing for some good. But here a doubt arises: whether it can be prudently believed that he who has a firm purpose in penance, and asserts that he does not wish to relapse further, but is certain that he will fall again, can be considered prudent? The first opinion affirms, and this is held by (those who assert the common view) Sporer p. 204 n. 3 to. item Vega, Dic, apud Ratio, because a purpose of will not to relapse can be well sustained with a judgment of intellect concerning a future lapse from known frailty.

But with the peace of so many DD., altogether hold the opposite sentiment, which Concina p. 255 n. 3 and Croix lib. 6 part. 2 n. 1822 maintain. Obiect. I do not deny that, speaking speculatively, a firm purpose of the will could well be consistent with a relapse in knowledge; but when someone believes with certainty that he will relapse, he thereby gives evidence of a certain suspicion, and thus his purpose of the will is not sufficiently firm; for it is impossible that one firmly propose to amend himself, knowing that God's assisting grace will not fail him as far as he can do, and yet believe with certainty that he will return to his sins despite these obstacles. Wherefore rightly Croix says in I. c., that such a penitent should be prepared for absolution, so that he may hope to be delivered from sins not by his own strength, but through the help of God. But otherwise it should be said, if the penitent fears relapse on account of his past weakness, commonly the DD. with Croix in lib. 6 p. 2 n. 1733 and others say that for a serious purpose it is not required that one believe himself secure from any relapse, but merely sufficient that now there be present a will to remain unwavering; for the will to repent can well coexist with a fear of falling due to a change in the will.

Hence rightly says Gerson: traditio 8 super quod poenitens Confessario

interroganti: Credis tu quod numquid cades in tule petum a respondeat; ego fragilis formido lapsum, non tamen caput i. Dubit. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. Now I present the case; commending myself to future mercy of God, I beseech that He may keep me from sin, and if my weakness should sit down, I pray that I may rise again. II.

It is required that the purpose be universal concerning mortal sins; whatever the Adversary says, let it be said. Hurtad. et Platell. according to Croix num. 898 assert, that since a congruent sorrow suffices for particular sins, so presumptuously may a particular purpose suffice, provided it excludes the positive delight in sinning; yet altogether opposed is this to the common opinion taught by Lugo, dist. 14 n. 52. Concisely presented on page two hundred fifty-nine note ten. Mazzotta tom. 7 pag. 343, et Croix l. c. cum Escob. et aliis passim, ex D. ubi ait: Paenitentia de peccatis mortalibus requirit, quod homo proponat abstinere ab omnibus et singulis aliqui criminis satis sit ad valorem Confessionis, cum dolor respiciat tantum peccata commissa, quae poenitens detestari debet; non tamen sufficit proposi- tum particulare, cum quisque teneatur habere voluntatem absolutam et positivam omnia mortalia vitandi. Wherein speaking in general terms about contrition at the Tridentine Session 14, Chapter 4, it says: "Contrition is the sorrow and detestation of a sin committed; it does not speak of all sins; but when speaking of the purpose, it says: 'With the purpose of not committing any further sin; yet the particle 'non' does not truly signify a universal purpose to avoid all mortal sins."

It is otherwise concerning the matter of venial sins; for in these it suffices (as he himself teaches in that place) that the penitent propose to abstain from some [sins], without proposing to abstain from all [sins]. III. It is required that the purpose be efficacious, that is, apt to effect what is proposed; and therefore it is necessary that the penitent not only propose to avoid sin, but also employ suitable means to avoid sin, and particularly to remove proximate occasions of sinning, as commonly taught by the DD. See Sporer p. 205 n. 313. It is not always true that a purpose is efficacious solely when it accomplishes what is proposed; otherwise, every time a penitent relapsed, he would have to immediately repeat Confessions; for a relapse is not always a sign of weak purpose, but often merely a sign of changed will. For it can very well happen that one truly has the love of God predominant and an unshakable resolve never to sin, yet still immediately sins, as Peter truly proposed rather to die than deny Christ, yet denied Him at the first maid's word; this is indeed confirmed by Gregory (Homily 30 on John), who said: In some hearts God comes but does not make a dwelling... to these return for perpetration of sin, as if they felt it least.

It is confirmed from the Roman Ritual where it is said: In regard to those who easily fall into sin, it has been most useful to consider consulting frequently, for example once a month, or on certain solemn days, that they confess, and if appropriate, also communicate. Principalis autem efficacia propo- iti (ut supra innuimus) consistit in avellendis occasionibus proximis peccandi, aut in mediis debitis adhibendis, ut ipsae, si sint necessariae, ex proximis fiant remotae. Wherefore it is diligently to be considered concerning these matters. 452 Inquiry III. How should the Confessor act towards those who are in a state of temptation to sin? And here there is doubt.

How manyfold is the occasion, and how manyfold the danger of sinning? The occasion is distinguished i. into proximate and remote. The remote occasion is that in which men are constituted as regularly as possible so as not to sin. But proximate occasion they define to be that in which a penitent is believed never or very rarely to abstain from sin, as Bonaventure defines at number 323. But this definition is not pleasing; rather it should be said as Sanchez states in his Decretum, I, i, c. 8, n. i.

Lugo d. 14 num. 149. . 32 s. 2 n. 4. 2 p. 255. Cross book 5 note 252. Segnerius chapter 54 section I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 56g et i what proximate occasion per se is that in which men commonly sin most: but proximate per accidens, or respective, is that which, although per se considered with respect to others it is not proximate, yet because it is not apt by its nature to induce men commonly to sin, nevertheless with respect to some thing is proximate; either because there has frequently fallen into this occasion although not nearly always nor often, yet frequently; or because considering its past weakness prudently the fall itself is feared.

Wherefore perniciously they say 150 and . 3 art. 4 n. 5 with others, that there is not in proximate occasion for adolescents who sin by consent, words, or touches when laboring with women; because (as they say) they do not often sin in such occasions; for as we said, to constitute a proximate occasion it suffices that man frequently labors therein. It must be noted that sometimes an occasion, which with respect to others is commonly proximate, can with respect to a very pious and cautious man be far removed, as they well observe. The distinction is made between voluntary and necessary occasions. Voluntaria est, quae facile dimitti potest; necessaria, quae physice vel moraliter non potest avelli. The proximate danger, however, is otherwise formal, otherwise material. Formal is that which is proximately connected with sin, so that a man constituted thereby will probably commit sin, either by consenting to it; and this danger should always be avoided.

This must, however, be understood (as Croix rightly points out in I. 5 num. 254), namely, that if the danger is consent, and not merely of simple temptation or movements. Material is that which is not closely connected to sin, but only remotely so, by reason of necessity and means which a man employs to avoid sin; hence it happens that the occasion itself is proximate, while the danger is remote: as can occur in a surgeon who, in treating the secret parts of a girl, would indeed be in a proximate occasion of sinning, but by reason of necessity. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance, if one applies due caution with pious thoughts, prayers, protestation of non-consent, then it can well be excused from guilt; because then, through divine assistance of grace, the danger is made remote and material. Through divine assistance of grace, the danger is made remote and material. See Cross l. 5 n. 254. From the aforementioned points it is inferred that there is in the proximate occasion him who retains at home a woman with whom he has often sinned. And this is to be noted, that if anyone does not have a woman at home with whom he sins, but always sins with her, and then goes to her house, then it will be in the near occasion to go there next time, even though he may have gone there once a year and sinned. Qui in ludo frequenter habitatur in blasphemias, vel fraudes.

He who in some tavern or conversation falls into drunkenness, brawls, lewd words, or lewd gestures. Such penitents are not to be regularly absolved unless they first desert the occasion. Likewise, they cannot be absolved who, although do not sin in occasion, yet provide scandal to others, as commonly taught by Palaus tr. 2 dist. 2 part. 9 n. 19. Bonaventura de 5 n. 269 et; aut tentatione vehementi, vel habitu aut tentatione vehementi, vel habitu vitioso, vel forti tentatione, peccet qui eam non relinquit, etsi necdum cesserit tentatio; quia raro accidet, quod talis se contineat, si ab occasione non separetur: unde ait Tournely, quod ancilla vivi- de sollicitata ab hero tenebatur ab illius domo discedere; qui enim libere commoratur, ubi tàm periculosè ad malum allicitur, non potest rationabiliter sperare vio- toriam tentationis; nisi auxiliis gratiae extraordinariis, quae sperari sine temeritate nequeunt ab eo, qui liberè periculum vitare potest, et non nisi auxiliis gratiae extraordinariis, quae sperari sine temeritate nequeunt ab eo, qui liberè periculum vitare potest, et non vitat. Haec tamen intelligenda sunt, si hujusmodi persona sit fragilis, et parùm devota; nam si esset pietati dedita, et cauta, et opportuna adhiberet remedia ad tentationes repel- lendas ac passioni obviandum, tunc eam non obstrin- gerem ad occasionem auferendam. He says however in Ronc. cap. 5 quæst. 8, that it is not to be denied Cap. I.

Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 571 If one grants absolution to a youth and a maiden who at some time intend to contract Matrimony; for no one (it is said) is bound to marry an unknown person, but rather to test them for some time in which each be endowed with such qualities. This assertion, when philosophically speaking, seems reasonably grounded; but I, having been taught by experience, would scarcely permit once or twice that the bridegroom be allowed to enter the house of the bride, or that the bride or her parents receive him into their home; for rarely do I find anyone who has not sinned in such an encounter, at least in words or thoughts. For all looks and conversations between such bridegrooms are incentives to sin, and morally it is impossible to treat each other without feeling base stimuli towards those things which will be future to them during the time of matrimony. In his [Confessor] however in all these matters, especially where the danger of a turpitudinous lapse is imminent, let him diligently observe that he will never have acted more cruelly towards a penitent than by acting benignly, and that the greater the severity he employs, the better he will consult the salvation of such an individual. Th.àVillanova (Fer. (Fer. 6 post Dom.) for he ought to counsel them; yet rather it would be more scandalous if after Confession he did not remove occasion: for either others are ignorant of his sin or danger, and then no evil will they suspect, as if someone dismisses a servant, or abstains from access to some house; or else others have already observed this, and then he will rather recover reputation in the estimation, than lose it.

From all these things I conclude that, speaking according to order, a penitent who is involved in a proximate voluntary occasion should never be absolved, even if he brings forward extraordinary signs of sorrow, before removing the occasion; for an external occasion, especially when it involves a vicious fault, so long as it is present, so much affects the mind that it exceeds by five percent Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, if one applies due caution with pious thoughts, prayers, a protestation of non-consent, and performs it well, then he can be excused from guilt; because then, through divine assistance by grace, the danger is removed both formally and materially.

See Cross 1. 5 n. 254. It is understood as being in an occasion proximate, him who at home retains a woman, qua which he has often sinned. And this must be noted, namely, that if anyone does not have a woman to his disposition with whom he may sin but always sins with her and goes to her house, then going to that place will be an occasion for sinning in the next proximate opportunity, even if he should go there only once in a year and sin. Qui frequenter in ludo habet occasione ad blasphemias vel fraudes. He who through some banquet, tavern, or conversation falls into

drunkenness, brawls, lewd words, or gestures.

Pecnitentes huiusmodi non sunt absolvendi regulariter, nisi prius occasionem deseruerint. Likewise, they cannot be absolved who, although do not sin in occasion, yet cause scandal to others, as commonly taught by Palaus tr. 2 dist. 2 part. 9 n. 19. Bonaventura de 5 n. 269 et; aut tentatione vehementi, vel habitu aut tentatione vehementi, vel habitu vitioso, vel forti tentatione, peccet qui eam non relinquit, etsi necdum cesserit tentatio; quia raro accidet, quod talis se contineat, si ab occasione non separetur: unde ait Tournely, quod ancilla vivida sollicitata ab hero tenetatur ab illius domo discedere; qui enim libere commoratur, ubi tam periculose ad malum allicitur, non potest rationabiliter sperare victoriam tentationis; nisi auxiliis gratiae extraordinariis, quae sperari sine temeritate nequeunt ab eo, qui liberè periculum vitare potest, et non nisi auxiliis gratiae extraordinariis, quae sperari sine temeritate nequeunt ab eo, qui libere periculum vitare potest, et non vitat. Haec tamen intelligenda sunt, si hujusmodi persona sit fragilis, et parum devota; nam si esset pietati dedita, et cauta, et opportuna adhiberet remedia ad tentationes repellendas ac passioni obviandum, tunc eam non obstinarem ad occasionem auferendam. He says however in Ronc. cap. 5 quæst. 8, that it is not to be denied Cap. I. Dub.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 371 If at some time a youth and a maiden approach with an intention to contract Matrimony; for no one (it is said) is bound to take a person unknown, but rather to test them by some means in which each may be found endowed with certain qualities. This assertion appears reasonable when speaking speculatively; but I, having been taught by experience, would scarcely permit once or twice that the bridegroom should enter the house of the bride, or that the bride herself or her parents should receive him in their home, for rarely do I find anyone who has not sinned in such an encounter, at least in words or thoughts; since all looks and conversations between such bridegrooms are incentives to sinning, and morally it is impossible to treat each other without being tempted by base stimuli towards things that will be future to them during the time of matrimony. In his [Confessor] however in all these matters, especially where the danger of a turpitudinous lapse is imminent, let him diligently observe that he will never have acted more cruelly towards a penitent than by acting benignly, and that the greater the severity with which he intervenes, the better he consults that person's salvation. Th.àVillanova (Fer. (Fer. 6 post Dom.) for he should counsel them; indeed it is rather to be feared that it will become a scandal if after Confession he does not remove an occasion: otherwise either others will remain ignorant of his sin or danger, and then no ill suspicions will arise—such as when someone dismisses a servant, or abstains from entering another's house

through improper access; or else others have already observed this, and then he would rather recover reputation than lose it. From all these things I conclude that, speaking in an ordinary manner, a penitent who is involved in a proximate voluntary occasion must never be absolved, even if he brings forward extraordinary signs of sorrow; for as long as the occasion remains present, it so completely overpowers the mind that it exceeds five lines.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, let all things proposed to memory be effaced; and so impel it to sins that even if someone knew his certain condemnation would follow from that crime, he would still not desist from sin. See below 453- Doubtful 2.

Whether one who exposes himself to a probable danger of sinning can be absolved? Affirmant Mendo. Gob. et Ca- ram. according to . and Hozes, n. 257. and they consent because (as they say), when it is probable that he will sin, and probable that he will not sin, he can form a certain conscience for himself, and consequently throw aside judgment and prejudice, considering himself not to be one who will sin. But we have already refuted this opinion in 1.5 n. 63 cum etc. Here I add authority from 2 qu. 10 art. 9, where it is expressly condemned, saying: The weak in faith, whose downfall can probably be feared, are to be prohibited from communion with the infidels. The reason is that, when there exists a probability of falling, there already presents itself a formal danger of lapse, which (as we have said) must be entirely avoided when the occasion is voluntary; but otherwise, if necessary (as we have said in 1.5 n.63 concerning the Physician and the Parson). Indeed, properly do Palaus t. 1 tr. 2 d. 2 p. 2 §. 3 n. 9 with Major. also . and . 2. n. 26. v. think.

Likewise, in necessity of extreme spiritual urgency, not only can you but also must you assist that person with such a probable danger; because then necessity makes it so that a remote danger is avoided; hence, if possible, you must do it; and this same thing teaches us, just after he said, that those who are suspected to be in peril of their salvation should be prohibited from communion with the infidels, unless necessity urge it. Tourn. however, in chapter 1 with Sylvius, says that if such a danger exists, that it is more probable for a lapse to occur, then you must in no way expose yourself to it, nor should you do so, because each one ought to regard his own salvation rather than that of others. But this could be responded to by saying that in such a case of extreme necessity, although the lapse may be probable and you should strongly fortify yourself against it with prayers and pious works, yet the lapse is not morally certain; Chapter I. Dub. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 375 and then to believe in greater assistance from God; for then it would be rationally hoped that God would augment the assistance where there will more urgently demand necessity. It is doubted 3. Whether a penitent, who is involved in an occasion of sin 454, can ever be absolved? Above all, it is necessary to observe four propositions proscribed in this matter. I. An paenitens, qui versatur in occasione 454 proxima voluntaria, possit umquam absolvi?

Proposition 41 condemned by Alexander VII stated: A concubinarian is not obliged to cast off his concubine if she would be excessively useful for maintaining the concubinage (commonly called a gift), since, when that one fails, life would be excessively harsh for her, and other banquets would cause great boredom to the concubine, and some other pretext would be excessively difficult to find. II. Propositio 61 damnata ab Inn. XI. dicebat: Potest aliquando absolvi, qui in proxima occasione peccandi versatur, quam potest et non vult omittere, quinimo directe et ex proposto quaerit, aut ei seingerit. III. dicebat: Potest aliquando absolvi, qui in proxima occasione peccandi versatur, quam potest et non vult omittere, quinimo directe et ex propo sito quaerit, aut ei seingerit.

Prop. 63. It is licit to directly seek the proximate occasion of sinning for our own or another's spiritual or temporal good. But it becomes doubtful whether he who has not yet removed the proximate occasion may be absolved either in the first or subsequent instance? The first opinion affirms this, and many authors hold thus, according to 32 sect. 2 n. 3. 2 p. 9§. 3 n. 18. Sporer n. 325. . 108.

Muzzotta t. 3 p. 577. VII. n. 16 (citing Cajet and Cordub., but P. Milante denies that these authors hold this opinion) and as commonly asserted: and the Reason agrees, because (as they say) such a penitent can be well disposed for absolution, presumptuous not yet dispensed from occasion, if he truly proposes to remit. But this must be distinguished from Saint Charles Borromeo (in his instructions to his confessors) regarding occasions which are in being, such as when someone keeps a concubine at home, or while some servant commits sin with a horse, whenever it is attempted by him; and also regarding occasions which are not in being, for instance if someone should speak blasphemously through loquacity, or burst into quarrels and drunkenness while defecating in an inn, or while dining with companions fall into obscene words and thoughts, etc. In the latter kind of occasions, Saint Charles rightly teaches that, if the penitent firmly proposes to avoid them, he can be absolved even after one, two, or three repetitions. Quod si postmodum emendatio non apparet, debet ei differri absolutio donec ille cum affectu occasionem derelinquat. In occasions of the first kind, which are in being, St. Charles says that

penitent should not be absolved even on the first occasion (whatever promises he may have made), unless first he removes the occasion. And I consider this judgment (at least by custom observing it) entirely to be followed; and the Cardinals hold this in Proposition 6i dam. from Innoc.

XI. with Bon. P. Segneri Instr. cui titulus: item 20 ubi ait: Concubinarius cohabitans concubinæ non debet absolvi antequam ab ea separetur. Conincl. d. 8. de ubi: Eos qui vivunt in con-cubinatu nullo modo extra casum gravis necessitatis expedit absolvere antequam de facto separentur l. 3 c. 3 q. 2 Resp. non posse licite eum absolvi antequam ab ea (scilicet concubina) separetur; item. Augustine in the chapter On Satisfaction says thus: The satisfaction of penance is to excise the causes of sins and not to yield an entrance to their suggestions. Therefore, the penitent is bound to remove the occasion before absolution, otherwise he would not have closed off the opportunity for suggestions.

The reason for this opinion (as the Cardinal says) seems to be that the first judgment appears to have been based on what was previously stated; but this reasoning does not convince; for it is one thing to be able to absolve him who does not wish to omit the occasion before absolution, as the proposition said, and another thing to be able to absolve him who, although he does not wish to omit it before absolution, yet wishes to omit it well immediately after absolution. Reason 2. because of the precept Chapter I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 37§ The removal of voluntary occasion is a negative thing, that is to say, not remaining in the occasion (as is the precept of not retaining what belongs to another), and this obligates always and forever; whence he who can remove the occasion immediately and does not do so, is in actual transgression of the precept, and therefore indisposed.

But this reason does not at all satisfy, or at least must be understood solely in the case where the penitent does not wish to immediately remove the occasion after absolution, and merely promises to do so in the future; but if the penitent firmly proposes to remove the occasion during the act of confession and returns home, I do not see why he should be considered indisposed or how it would be said that he transgresses the precept. The better and truer reason seems to me to be this: the removal of occasion is a thing most difficult to accomplish, and it does not happen unless one inflicts great violence upon himself so as to be torn away from that occasion, to which he remains very prone on account of his former adherence of mind; and therefore, if the occasion is not removed before absolution, the penitent will easily deceive himself after absolution, falsely persuading himself that he will be restored in temptations; and thus, with the occasion not having been dismissed, he will certainly return to the

vomit. In regard to which matter, if one should wish to be absolved before deserting that occasion, he would be indisposed because he would set himself in a probable risk of violating his purpose: and therefore the Confessor who were to absolve him while leaving him in such a risk, would sin both against the office of the Judge and of the Physician, since by not applying that remedy necessary for his salvation, he would absolve an indisposed person. You will say: A penitent who has a probable opinion in his favor ought to be absolved, because, being disposed [for absolution], he has a right to absolution according to what is said 1. 1 n. 25 and dicenda n. 604. Therefore, if anyone should form a probable conscience according to the first judgment, the confessor would be bound to absolve him.

It is replied that it is illicit (as we said above in note 453 dub. 2) for one to voluntarily expose himself to a probable risk of sinning; hence, the penitent who wishes to receive absolution before dismissing an occasion sins, when he exposes himself thus, thinking that he has a probable conscience. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: it is invalid in a probable danger of violating one's purpose; and therefore, as being indisposed, one has no right to absolution.

Response is given, 2. Given and not conceded, that the penitent may be absolved once or twice before the occasion is remitted; nevertheless, as commonly say the Doctors and even their adversaries concede, the penitent does not have the right to be absolved immediately; and therefore it is well (and if he can, the Confessor is bound) as a Physician to defer that absolution until the occasion is removed. However, I spoke commonly; for it is rightly accepted from Lugo, d. 14, n. 151, and Sporer, a. 325, that in cases where the penitent presents extraordinary signs of sorrow, then because of such signs the confessor prudently can judge; not to be present in the penitent any proximate danger of infringing upon the more abundant grace received, which he would maintain more steadfastly in removing the occasion. Nevertheless, he says; and so presumptuously would I act. Excipiendus a cum Lugo d. 14 n. 151. et Sporer a. 325. casus, quo pœnitens si absolutio differatur, non possit ad Confessarium redire; vel nonnisi post longum tempus: tunc enim, si ille jam fuerit confessus peccata sua, et Confessarius prudenter judicare valeat, eum firmam habere voluntatem tollendi occasionem statim ac poterit, tunc potest et debet ipsum absolvere, quia tunc pœnitens habet jus, ut statim absolvatur.

Neither does it hinder saying that he himself would then remain in the same danger (as was said just now) of infringing his purpose. For it is said that in this case such a danger from the near future is made remote: for gravely damaging consequences (as will be said below) do not bind the

penitent to bring about an occasion, because the danger itself, by reason of that necessity, is thereby rendered remote; thus in our case the danger of infringing the purpose is made remote by reason of a great burden which the penitent ought to bear, Chapter I. Dub. II. On the essence of this sacrament. Repetition of confession before another person; for then one is constituted under a moral necessity to receive absolution before dismissing the occasion.

This, however, is not to be admitted if the penitent has already been admonished by another Confessor about removing the occasion and has not abstained from it; because then he is considered as a recidivist, and he is to be absolved only minimally unless he brings forward extraordinary signs of sorrow, as was stated above. Doubt is 4. May they be absolved who are in a necessary proximate occasion? As we indicated above, indeed it is called a necessary occasion which cannot be left either physically or morally; physically, namely, if someone were in prison or on a trireme from which he could not depart; or if he were at the point of death, in which there would be no time or manner to expel a friend: but morally, if an occasion could not be removed without scandal; in these cases absolution can be given; the occasion not having been removed, since the penitent is not then bound to remove that. But here arises the doubt: whether one may remain in proximate occasion, if otherwise one ought to suffer notable temporal harm in life, fame, or fortune?

Merbesius in his treatise on Penitence, diss. 4n. 11, denies this, saying that no one can be excused from avoiding a proximate occasion of sin for any temporal damage; and he agrees with Wig. tr. 5 n. 5o., where it is said that there is an obligation to remove the occasion even if infamy must be endured. Nevertheless, commonly the PP affirm that a penitent is not released from the occasion of giving it up, if otherwise he would suffer grave temporal damage in life, reputation, or fortune, provided only that meanwhile he be ready to use the prescribed means; thus 1 cap. 8 n. 3. Lugo, Decretum, distinguitio 14, nota 152. cum communi, decima 2, distinguitio 2, partium 9, sectio 3, nota 8. Tourn. tom. 2 p. 255 et 258. Reg. 3. anaci. p. 6i9 n. 46. v.

I have spoken, Bonac. de Mal. art. 3 quaest. 2 num. 6, n. 104. Renzi c. 2 sectio 1. quaestio 15. Sporer n. 326. (qui tamen n. 328. cum Palao non excusat aliquem mediocriter divitem, qui ne patiatur damnum centum ducatorum, occasionem non vellet deserere) et consensus Cencina p. 265. 17. si poe- 3/8 Lib. VI. Traet.

IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It should strenuously insist upon reconciliation with the father on account of the removal of occasion; or it

would cause a most serious harm. Reason, because the occasion of sinning is in itself neither sin nor does it entail necessity for sinning; hence, true detestation of sins and a firm resolution not to relapse and to apply due remedies can well coexist with it. And although the precept to avoid a proximate occasion of sin by itself obliges one not to remain in that occasion, yet it is to be understood as obliging when someone persistently remains in the occasion voluntarily, and not if he remains there out of necessity; but morally speaking, this necessity intervenes when without great detriment or inconvenience it cannot be avoided; for then, with opportune means employed to avoid relapse, the formal and proximate danger becomes material and remote; for one does not perish who is in peril, but only one who loves peril (as it is said in Ecclesiasticus 3); whereas he who involuntarily suffers that which constitutes a peril does not love it. Hence, optimally, S. Basil (in) said: He who, urged and by necessity, exposes himself to danger or permits himself to be in it, although he would rather be otherwise, is not so much said to love the danger as to involuntarily endure it; and therefore God will more carefully provide lest he perish in that.

The same is sufficiently confirmed from c. Laudabile de Frig. et Mal., where it stands thus: That both (the discourse refers to those who have been impotent from the beginning) should consent together that the man may have her as his sister, even though not his wife. Therefore (as is noted . Remedia autem his, qui reperiuntur in occasione proxima praesertim peccati turpis, sunt: major oratio, frequentior usus Sacramentorum, quotidiana ante imaginem. Renewal of the promise upon being fixed to the Cross does not allow for greater sinning; renewal of the promise upon being fixed to the Cross does not allow for greater sinning, nor turning alone with alone, fleeing from the aspect of the complicating one, and similar things. Here they say Sporer n. 322. with the common Bus. as above case 'io.

Mazzotta t. 3 p. 574. c. n. 12. cum Graf. c. 4 n. 9. cum. Sanchez, Sa Henr. Cajet and Philiarch, Cap. I. Dub. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 379 Those who refuse to depart from their office, business, or house in which they sin, because without great difficulty they cannot, are to be absolved if they are prepared to employ the means of remedy. The same is said in article 3, note 4, number 9, concerning surgeons who sin repeatedly in healing women, and concerning parish priests who repeatedly receive their confessions, if they themselves cannot otherwise live according to their state. See the aforementioned lawbook, lib. 5, n. 63, verse. It is asked. These opinions are very probable; nevertheless, in practice all agree that it is expedient to

defer absolution to those who are involved in an immediate occasion until they have received a presumed necessary sacramental confession.

But, truly, as for myself, candidly speaking: I would never absolve him who is in an extrinsic proximate occasion (for concerning intrinsic occasions I shall speak below), especially if the occasion be one of turpitude, since the absolution could always and conveniently be deferred. I hold that the Confessor is bound to provide his penitent with remedies more opportune for his punishment, so that he may work his own salvation; and I demand that no other remedy be administered to him who is in proximate occasion than a delay of absolution; since experience teaches that penitents, after they have been dismissed upon being absolved, neglect above all to observe the prescribed means, and thus easily relapse. When, on the contrary, absolute denial is given, they diligently seek to carry out remedies and resist temptations, being urged by fear lest, when they return to the Confessor, they again depart without absolution. And in the case where the penitent, having previously been admonished by another Confessor to observe the prescribed means, has neglected them in the same manner and relapsed: I say that he must be altogether dismissed without absolution, unless perhaps extraordinary signs of sorrow are exhibited. And speaking in a regular sense, I would deny him absolution when convenient absolution could be deferred, although he has been granted this still extraordinary compunction.

Perhaps to some this will appear excessively harsh; but I, having thus offended penitents ensnared by such occasions, have always acted in this manner and always shall act; for this is my way: walking not as one rigid, but most especially toward them. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament.

Penitence. I consider it to be benign, since no mode seems more apt for this purpose, that they themselves might be delivered from sins and from eternal damnation; on the contrary, I would believe that, if by acting benignly I grant them the absolution which they seek, I would thereby be a cause of their growing worse in vices. Each one will abound according to his own sense. Would that all confessors behaved towards such penitents in this manner; much fewer crimes would be committed, and many more souls would be kept from perdition! I feel and say that where there is question of liberating a penitent from formal sin, although it is permitted to him to remain in the material state, then the confessor should take care, within the limits conceded by Christian prudence, to favor more lenient opinions, yet strongly grounded in solid reasons. Where, however, benign opinions more closely approach the danger of formal sin, as happens in this matter with the occasion of proximate temptation, I say that it is

expedient for the Confessor to use judgments more rigorous; thus he will more effectively consult the salvation of his penitents. 45. There is doubt. 5.

Whether he who, in a necessary occasion, always relapses after presumptuously employing remedies, can be absolved unless first he desert the occasion? The first opinion, which Lugo holds in his treatise De Poeni, d. 14, n. 152, p. 9, n. 3. Fabri, Pallav. and others at Croix 1. 5 n. 261 consider it probable. Conf. 1. c. n. 10 dicit: posse eum toties quoties absolvi modo habeat sufficientem dolorem et propositum. (Advertit tamen Lugo n. 160 quod cum aliquis semper immediè post Confessionem facile recidit, censeatur carere vero dolore et proposito et ideò non sit absolvendus.) Secunda tamen verior sententia quam tuentur Tourn. tom. 2 p. 258. Reg. 3. 41. num. 17 cum et item c. qui vocat veram fengt hunc non posse absolvi nisi occasionem deserat praesumptum cum jactura vitæ si opus sit quando nulla emendatio nec pro Cap. L Dub.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. Babylonian hope of amendment appears. Reason, because man is bound to avoid every loss of the proximate danger of a formal sin. And although on account of a just cause the danger of sin may sometimes be permitted, never can sin itself be permitted: for when there is no hope of amendment apparent, the danger indeed becomes formal, and from it sin cannot follow, and therefore it must absolutely be avoided with any presumed temporal damage to life. Here indeed runs that saying: If thy eye is a stumbling-block to thee, cast it out.

It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. And besides, Luke 25. For what does it profit a man if he gains the whole world, but at the same time he loses himself and incurs damage to himself? You will say with Lugo: 'Therefore, this person could not be absolved even in the first instance, since danger would have been present.' I respond that the reason is different, because when an occasion is necessary, through means a materially proximate danger becomes formally remote; but when remedies are applied and there is no hope of amendment, the danger formally proximate is avoided altogether, and thus it is to be entirely avoided with any inconvenience.

But if (says St. Charles in Instruct.) I respond that it is inappropriate to reason thus; for since an occasion is necessary, by means of mediators the proximate material danger becomes formally remote; but when remedies are applied and there is no hope of amendment, the danger formally proximate is avoided altogether, and hence it must be entirely avoided

with whatever inconvenience. But if (as Saint Carolus says in Instruct), after similar precautions a Confessor should discover that a penitent has relapsed into that sin, absolute absolution is utterly denied until he removes the proximate occasion of sinning; whatever may eventually happen is said to be: I ought to dismiss my soldiers, merchants, courtiers, etc., who know that they cannot perform those duties without sinning; thus speaks Saint Falsos. Therefore whoever, whether a soldier or merchant or engaged in some office, finds he cannot exercise his duty without sin (difficulty noted by the Glossa, not impossibility), if he has been ensnared by serious faults and come to penance, should recognize that he cannot truly perform true penance unless he abandons the business or office. The same [person] clearly confirms Innocence. II. in dict. c. Fratres, dicens: Falsa enim fit pentientia, cum pentients ab officio vel curiati, vel 382 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance: the negotiation does not cease, for if sin were to occur, no rational pretext would prevail. According to the aforementioned, it should be said with n. 583 and 326, as well as with others commonly agreed upon, if in this present penitent extraordinary signs of sorrow are brought; for then hope of amendment already shines forth. Herein serves as a complement to this point to add what D. Charles Borromaeus has transmitted in the Instructio 653, where distinguishing between proximate occasions of sin induced by oneself, such as keeping concubine at home, and proximate occasions of sinning due to some perverted habit, he said: A penitent engaged in any of these occasions; if that occasion be urgent, like one who would take a concubine to bed, he certainly should not doubt the Confessor's absolution (understand, not even for the first time), unless this occasion has already been overcome. For other occasions (less pressing ones), namely recreation, a less modest look, conversation, gestures, etc., absolution is not granted unless the penitent promises to dispense with them.

Quod si iam alius pollicitus sit nec emendatus fuerit, absolutio differatur donec emendationem agnoverit. Then he added: Concerning works that incline to evil, such as the publication of scandals, the frequenting of dishonest men, and taverns, and other similar things, by means of which a man has accustomed himself to sin, it is altogether unfitting that one be absolved unless first he entirely desists from them. If it has seemed fit to the Confessor from the first or second penitent's promise, and he does not intend to allow this occasion any further, he may absolve him; but if he has not stood by his promises, then let the absolution be deferred until he acknowledges that the occasion has been entirely removed. And because it may happen that the penitent cannot without risk of damage to life, reputation, or goods, or scandal, remove from the Confessor all these

proposed occasions thereof, he should apply remedies; and the absolution is to be deferred until the occasion has been entirely removed. Doubt.

II. Concerning the essence of this Sacrament. 385. Let that shining one confess the first time the sin (until he has given signs of amendment. If, however, disgraceful danger should arise from this (namely, if he incurs disgrace unless then he communicates), and the Confessor perceives such signs of contrition in him (so that he may judge the disposition to be prepared), and has observed the disposition for providing remedies, then he can absolve. If however the penitent has not amended (namely, despite having recourse to remedies), he shall not be absolved until that occasion is removed. Question IV.

Can they be absolved who are conjugal partners in sins 45 or recidivists? It must be distinguished between those who are conjoined in habitual sin or concupiscence, and those who are recidivists. Consuetudinarius intelligitur hic qui prima vice suum pravum habitum confitetur, et iste potest absolvi, etiamsi nulla emendatio praecesserit, modo eam serio proponat, ut cum sententia commu- nissima dicit Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1820. Reason, because such a penitent on one side is not to be presumed evil so as to wish to approach the Sacrament in an indisposed state; on another side he is well presumed disposed by his own confession of sins, since the very spontaneous confession is a sign of contrition, unless some positive presumption against it obstructs; for all agree that pain is made manifest through Confession. See vol. 7 p. 408; for although an evil habit makes the sinner more disposed to sin, it nevertheless does not give presumption of the weakness of his will.

Attend what the Catechism teaches: If, after having heard the Confession, the Priest judges that neither diligence in enumerating the sins nor detestation of the pain of penance has altogether been lacking, he may absolve. Note absolutely lacked. Recidivus autem est ille, qui post Confessionem in eisdem peccatis relapsus est. This is doubted, whether he can be absolved? There are three opinions, the first which Sylvester holds.

Henry translates that which is not in being, as if someone speaking carelessly might utter blasphemies; or, by gaming in an inn, might break out into quarrels and drunkenness; or, by dining with companions, might fall into obscene words and thoughts, etc. In occasions of this second kind, which are not in being, rightly does Charles teach that, if the penitent firmly proposes to avoid them, he may be absolved even after one, or two, and indeed three repetitions. That is to say, if subsequent amendment does not appear, his absolution should be deferred until he has abandoned the occasion with a contrite heart. In occasions of the prior species, which are

in esse, says St. Charles, a penitent is not to be absolved at the first instance (whatever promises he may have made), unless he first removes the occasion. And I consider this judgment (albeit commonly by careful reading) to be entirely to be followed; and the Cardinals hold it in Proposition 6i dam. from Innoc. XI. with Bon.

P. Segneri Instr. cui titulus: item 20 ubi ait: Concubinarius cohabitans concubinæ non debet absolvi antequam ab ea separetur. Conincl. d. 8. de Pœnit. de 17 n. 113. ubi: Nullo modo eos qui vivunt in concubinata extrà casum gravis necessitatis expedit absolvere, antequam de facto separentur; l. 3 c. 3 q. 2 Resp. non posse licité eum absolvi, antequam ab ea (scilicet concubina) separetur; item. Augustine in the Treatise on Satisfaction, concerning Penance. Distinction 3. where he says thus: The satisfaction of penance is to remove the occasions of sins and not to yield an entrance to their suggestions. Therefore, the penitent is bound to remove the occasion before absolution, otherwise not to have prevented access through suggestions.

Reason for this judgment (as says the Cardinal), seems to be that the first proposition appears to be condemned in the aforementioned sedens; but this reason does not convince; for it is one thing to be able to absolve him who does not wish to omit the occasion before absolution, as said the proposition, and another thing to be able to absolve him who, although he does not wish to omit the occasion before absolution, yet nevertheless wishes to omit it properly immediately after absolution. Reason 2. because of the precept Chapter I. Dub. II. It is the essence of this Sacrament to remove voluntarily an occasion of sinning, that is, not remaining in the occasion (as is the precept of not retaining someone else's property), and this obligates always and forever; hence, he who can remove the occasion immediately and does not do so is in actual transgression of the precept, and therefore indisposed.

But this reason by no means satisfies, or at least must be understood in a single case, where the penitent does not wish to immediately remove the occasion after absolution and merely promises to do so in the future; but if the penitent firmly proposes in the act of Confession to remove the occasion immediately and return home, I do not see why he should be considered indisposed or how it would be said that he contravenes the precept. The reason seems to me more potent and true: the removal of an occasion is a very difficult task, and it does not occur unless one inflicts great violence upon himself in order to be torn away from that occasion, to which he remains very prone on account of his past attachment of mind; and thus, if the occasion is not removed before 'absolution', the penitent will easily deceive himself after absolution, falsely persuading himself that

he will be restored through temptations; and so, with the occasion not having been dismissed, he will surely return to the vomit. In regard to which matter, if one should wish to be absolved before deserting the occasion, he would be indisposed because he would set himself in a probable risk of infringing his purpose: and therefore the Confessor who were to absolve him while leaving him in such a risk, would certainly sin both against the office of the Judge and that of the Physician, since he would absolve the indisposed person without applying to him the remedy necessary for his salvation. You would say: A penitent who has a probable opinion in his favor should be absolved, because, being disposed [for absolution], he has a right to absolution according to what is said 1. 1 n. 25., and also according to the aforementioned number 604. Therefore, si quis efformaret sibi conscientiam probabilem, juxta primam sententiam, tenendum esset Confessarium ut eum absolveret.

It is replied that it is illicit (as we said just above n. 453 dub. 2) for one to voluntarily expose himself to a probable occasion of sinning; hence, the penitent who wishes to receive absolution before he avoids the opportunity sins. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. There is no right to absolution, as if indisposed, in a probable danger of offending against one's purpose; and therefore, just as being indisposed, he has no right to absolution.

Response is given, 2. Given and not conceded, that the penitent may be absolved once or twice before the dismissal of the occasion, nevertheless, as commonly say both the Doctors and even their adversaries, the penitent does not have the right to be absolved immediately; and therefore it is well (and if he can, the Confessor is bound) as a Physician to defer that absolution until the occasion is removed. However, I spoke commonly; for it is rightly received with Lugo on day 14, number 151, and Sporer in article 325, that in cases where a penitent presents extraordinary signs of sorrow, then because of such signs the Confessor prudently can judge that there is no imminent danger of the penitent's next sinning; for those signs indicate that the penitent has abundantly received grace, which enables him to more steadfastly resist occasions of sin. Nevertheless, he says; and so presumptuously would I act. The case is excusable 2 with . whereupon, if penitent cannot return to confessor; or only after a long time: for then, if he has already confessed his sins and the confessor can prudently judge, he will have the firm intention of immediately removing the occasion as soon as possible. Then he can and should absolve him, because at that time the penitent has the right to be absolved immediately.

Neither does it hinder saying that he himself would then remain in the same danger (as was said just now) of infringing the proposed purpose. For

it is replied that in this case such a danger from the near future should be made remote: for gravely harmful damage (as will be said below) does not bind the penitent to bring about an occasion of sin, because the danger itself, by reason of that necessity, becomes remote; thus in our case the danger of infringing the purpose is made remote by reason of a great burden which the penitent should bear again, Chapter I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. Repetition of Confession before another; for then one is constituted under moral necessity to receive absolution before dismissing the occasion.

This, however, is not to be admitted; if the penitent has already been admonished by another Confessor about removing the occasion and has not abstained from it, because then he is considered as a recidivist, and he is to be absolved only minimally unless he brings forward extraordinary signs of sorrow, as was stated above. Doubt is had 4. Can they be absolved who are in a necessary proximate occasion? As we indicated above, indeed it is called a necessary occasion, which cannot be left either physically or morally; physically, namely, if someone were in prison or on a trireme from which he could not depart; or if one were at the point of death, in which there would be no time or manner to expel a friend: morally, however, if an occasion could not be removed without scandal; in these cases absolution can be given; with the occasion not removed, since the penitent is not then bound to remove that. But here a doubt arises: whether one may remain in proximate occasion, if otherwise one ought to suffer notable temporal harm in life, fame, or fortune?

Merbesius in diss. 4 de Poenit. negat nullo damno temporali excusari à dimitenda occasione proxima; et in parte Wig. tr. 5 n. 5o consentit ubi ait obligationem esse auferendi occasionem, etiamsi infamia sit subeunda. However, commonly the Doctors affirm that a penitent is not released from the occasion of sinning by dismissing it, if otherwise he would suffer grave temporal damage in life, reputation, or fortune; provided only that meanwhile he be ready to use the prescribed means; thus says cap. 8 n. 3. Lugo, chapter 14, note 152, with common opinion, book 2, part 2, page 9, section 3, note 8. Tourn. tom. 2 p. 255 et 258. Reg. 3. v.

I have said, Bonac. in IIIa, q. 2, n. 6, 104. Renzi, c. 2, sectio 1, quaestio 15. Sporer n. 326. (qui tamen n. 328. cum Palao non excusat aliquem mediocriter divitem, qui ne patiatur damnum centum ducatorum, occasionem non vellet deserere) et consensuit Cencina p. 265. n. 17. si poe- 378 Lib. VI. Tract.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It should strenuously strive for the removal of occasion; or it would cause the gravest harm. Reason,

because an occasion of sin in itself is neither sin nor entails necessity for sinning; hence, true detestation of sins and a firm resolution not to relapse and to apply due remedies can well coexist with it. And although the precept to avoid a proximate occasion of sin by itself obliges one not to remain in that occasion, yet it is to be understood as obliging when someone persists voluntarily in the occasion, and not if he remains there out of necessity; but morally speaking, this necessity of intervention is to be considered when without great detriment or inconvenience the occasion cannot be avoided; for then, with opportune means employed to avoid relapse, the formal and proximate danger becomes material and remote; for it is not one who is in peril that perishes thereby (as it is said in Ecclesiasticus 3), but one who loves peril; whereas he who suffers a thing unwillingly does not love that peril. Hence optimally S. Basil (in) said: Qui urgenti aliqua causa et necessitate se periculo objicit vel permittit se esse in illo, cum tamen aliae nollet, non tam dicitur amare periculum quàm invitus illud subire; et ideo magis providebit Deus ne iò illo pereat.

The same is sufficiently confirmed from the c. Laudabile de Frig. et Mal., where it stands thus: That both (the discourse refers to those who are impotent from the beginning) have consented at the same time that the man should regard her as his wife, even though not as his wife, at least as his sister. Therefore (as is noted). Remedia autem his, qui reperiuntur in occasione proxima praesertim peccati turpis, sunt: major oratio, frequentior usus Sacramentorum, quotidiana ante imaginem Crucis fixi renovatio promissionis non amplius peceandi; Cruci-fixi renovatio promissionis non amplius peccandi; vitandique, ne versetur solus cum sola, fugiendi ab aspectu complicis, et similia. Hereupon Sporer n. 322 says: when common, Bus. as above case. io. Mazzotta t. 3 p. 574 . c. n. 12. cum Graff. c. 4 n. 9. cum.

Sanchez, 8a Henr. Cajet and Philiarch, Cap. I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 379 Those who refuse to depart from their office, business, or house in which they sin, because without great difficulty they cannot, are to be absolved if they are prepared to employ the means of remedy.

The same is said in article 3, note 4, number 9, concerning surgeons who sin repeatedly in healing women, and concerning parish priests who repeatedly receive their confessions, if they themselves could not live otherwise according to their state. See the aforementioned lawbook, lib. 5, n. 63, verse. It is asked. These opinions are very probable; nevertheless, in practice all agree that it is expedient to defer absolution to those who are involved in an immediate occasion until they have received a presumed necessary sacramental confession. But, truly, as for myself, candidly

speaking: I would never absolve him who is in an extrinsic proximate occasion (for concerning intrinsic occasions I shall speak below), especially if the occasion be one involving turpitude, since the absolution could always and conveniently be deferred.

I hold therefore that the Confessor is bound to provide his penitent with more opportune remedies as a physician would, so that he may work his own salvation; and further, that no other remedy can be administered more appropriately to him who is in proximate occasion than the delay of absolution; for experience teaches that penitents, after they have been dismissed upon absolution, neglect above all to observe the prescribed means, and thus most easily relapse. When, on the contrary, absolute denial is given, they seek more diligently to put remedies into effect and resist temptations, being driven by fear lest, when they return to the Confessor, they again be dismissed without absolution. And in the case where the penitent, having previously been admonished by another Confessor to observe the prescribed means, has neglected them and relapsed in the same manner, I say that he must be altogether dismissed without absolution, unless perhaps extraordinary signs of sorrow are exhibited. And presumptuously, having been thus far endowed with an extraordinary compunction, speaking in a regular sense, I would deny him absolution when convenient absolution could be deferred. Perhaps to some this will appear excessively rigorous; but I, having thus offended penitents ensnared by such occasions, have always acted in this manner and always shall act; for this is my way of proceeding: not making myself rigid towards them, but most especially attentive towards them.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament. I consider forgiveness to be benign when no other mode seems more fitting for them to be themselves delivered from sins and from eternal damnation; on the contrary, I would believe that, if by acting benignly I grant them the absolution they seek, it would be a cause that they might grow worse in vices.

Each one abounds according to his own sense. I wish indeed that all confessors would conduct themselves towards such penitents in this manner; many fewer crimes would be committed, and far more souls would avoid perdition! I feel and say that where there is question of liberating a formal penitent from sin, although it is permitted for him to make satisfaction in the material aspect, then the confessor should take care thereof as much as Christian prudence allows, leaning towards more lenient opinions, yet strongly grounded in solid reasons. Wherever indeed benign opinions bring one closer to the danger of formal sin, as happens in this matter with the occasion of sin being proximate, I say that it is expedient for the Confessor to use stricter judgments; thus he will more

effectively consult the salvation of his penitents. 45? There is doubt. 5. He who, in a necessary occasion, always relapses after presumptuously employing remedies, can be absolved unless first he desert the occasion?

The first opinion, which Lugo holds in the Penitence, d. 14, n. 152, 2 p. 9, n. 3. Fabri, Pallav. and others at Croix 1. 5 n. 261 consider it probable. Confessio 1, cap. n. 10, n. 10 dicit: posse eum toties quoties absolvi modo habeat sufficientem dolorem et propositum. (Advertit tamen Lugo n. 160, quod cum aliquis semper immediate post Confessionem facile recidit, censeatur carere vero dolore et proposito, et ideo non sit absolvendus.) Secunda tamen verior sententia quam tuentur Tournai tom. 2 p. 258. Reg. 3. 41. num. 17 cum et item c. qui vocat veram tenet hunc non posse absolvi nisi occasionem deserat praesumptum cum jactura vitae si opus sit quando nulla emendatio nec pro Cap. I. Dub.

II. On the essence of this Sacrament. The Babylonian hope of amendment appears. Reason, because man is bound to avoid every loss of the proximate danger of a formal sin. And although some danger of sin may sometimes be permitted for a just cause, never can sin itself be permitted: since no hope of amendment appears, the danger then becomes formal, and it cannot follow from any sin, and thus it is altogether to be avoided with whatever temporal loss one might presume in life. Here indeed runs that saying: If thy eye is a stumbling-block to thee, cast it out.

It is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes, that thou shouldst be cast into hell fire. And from another Light. 25. Nam quid proficit homo, si lucratur universum mundi, sed ipse perdat se ipsum et detrimentium suum faciat? You will say with Lugo: 'Therefore, this person could not be absolved in the first instance, since thereby danger would have been present.' I respond that the reason is different, because since an occasion is necessary, through the means of remedy a materially proximate danger becomes formally remote; but when remedies are applied and there is no hope of amendment, the danger formally proximate is avoided altogether, and hence it ought to be entirely avoided with whatever inconvenience.

But if (says St. Charles in Instruct.) Confess. speaking about a girl who has at home an occasion of necessity), after similar precautions the Confessor having discovered that the penitent has relapsed into that sin, absolutely refuses absolution until she withdraws the proximate occasion of sinning; whatever may eventually happen is said. I ought to dismiss my soldiers, merchants, officials, etc., who know that they cannot exercise those functions without sinning; thus speaks S. Falsos: Therefore whoever, whether a soldier or a merchant or engaged in some office, finds himself

unable (the difficulty is noted, the Glossa observes) to perform his task without falling into grave sin, if he has been drawn by serious guilt to penance, should recognize that he cannot truly carry out penance unless he abandons his business or office. The same [person] clearly confirms Innocence. II. in dict. c. Fratres, dicens: Falsa enim fit penitentia, cum penitens ab officio vel curiali vel negotiario recedat, sine quibus non possit exerceri sua officium sine peccato;ideo quicumque miles vel negotiator vel alicui officio dedicatus si ad penitentiam venerit irretitus graviosis culpis, recognoscat se veram penitentiam peragere nisi negotium aut officium deseruerit. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. The negotiation does not cease, for there is no reason that prevails which can be done without sin. But it is to be said according to Holzner n. 583: 326 and similarly with others commonly, that if in this present penitent extraordinary signs of sorrow are brought; then indeed hope of amendment already shines forth. Hereby, for the completion of this point, it refers to adding what was handed down by D. Charles Borromeo in Instruct. p. 4, page 653, where distinguishing between proximate occasions of sin induced personally, such as keeping a concubine at home, and proximate occasions of sinning due to some perverted habit, he said: A penitent involved in any of these occasions; if that occasion is urgent, such as one who wishes to keep a concubine, he certainly should not be absolved by the Confessor even once without doubt, unless this occasion has been previously removed. For other occasions (less pressing ones), such as leisure, a less modest look, colloquies, gestures, etc., absolution is not granted unless the penitent promises to dispense with them.

Quod si jam alius pollicitus sit, nec emendatus fuerit, absolutio differatur, donec emendationem agnoverit. Then he added: Concerning works that incline to evil, such as public dancing, frequenting taverns, and crowds of people, and other similar occasions, by which a man has accustomed himself to sinning, it is altogether unfitting that he be absolved unless first he entirely desist from them. If it has seemed to the Confessor from the first or second penitent's promise that he will not avail himself of this occasion any further, then he may absolve him; but if he has not stood by his promises, let the absolution be deferred until he shall have acknowledged that the occasion has been entirely removed. And because it can happen that the penitent cannot without danger of loss of life, reputation, or goods, or scandal, dispense from all these things proposed by the Confessor, he should apply a remedy; and the delayed absolution is to be understood even if the penalty has been incurred. Doubt.

II. Concerning the essence of this Sacrament. 385. Let that shining one

confess the first time the sin (until he has given signs of amendment. If, however, disgraceful danger should arise from this (namely, if he incurs disgrace unless then he communicates), and the Confessor perceives such signs of contrition in him (so that he judges the disposition to be prepared for correction), and has observed the disposition for remedies, then he can absolve. If however the penitent has not amended (namely, despite having recourse to remedies), he shall not be absolved until that occasion is removed. Question is raised IV.

Whether those who are concupiscentially inclined or relapsing in 45 sins can be absolved? Must be distinguished between habitual and recurrent. A consuetudinarius entenditur hic qui in primam vitam suum pravum habitum confitetur, et iste potest absolvi, etiamsi nulla emendatio praecesserit, modo eam serio proponat, ut cum sententia communissima dicit Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 182o. Reason, because such a penitent on one side is not to be presumed evil so as to wish indisposedly to approach the Sacrament; but on another side he is well presumed disposed inasmuch as he confesses his sins, since the very spontaneous confession is a sign of contrition, unless some positive presumption against it obstructs; for all agree that pain is made manifest through Confession. See vol. 7 p. 408; for although corrupt habits make the sinner more disposed to sin, they nevertheless do not give presumption of the weakness of his will.

Attend what the Catechism teaches: If, after hearing the confession, the priest judges that neither diligence in enumerating the sins nor the pain and detestation of penitence has at all been wanting, he may absolve. Note absolutely lacked. Recidivus autem est ille, qui post Confessionem in eisdem peccatis relapsus est. This is doubted, whether he can be absolved? There are three opinions, the first which Sylvester holds.

Henry translates volume 384 chapter/librium. VI. Traot. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. 17th proposition states: this is to be absolved as often as it is confessed, unless some circumstance judges it unfit; otherwise, it is always considered fit and entitled to absolution.

But this opinion is false, as we shall say below. The second sentence, completely opposed to this, which 141 hold. Reg. 2 et 3. de Concina p. 360 § 4. per totum; although elsewhere on page 722 n. 24 and on page 719 he thus moderates his doctrine in practice, saying: And that you may avoid the danger of erring, if you see either bind or trind absolution to be able to care for the infirm, be rich in mercy. Correction of the minister is a safer norm than all the rules concerning either granting or denying absolution. The third common opinion, which we follow and hold, is found in 2 c. 32 n. 45 et 1. 3 c. 5 n. 13. . 18 de Juram. d. 1 p. 9 num. 3. 4 qu. 1 pag. 3 in

fine, Lugo d. 16 n. 166.

Petrocor. to. 4 de tit. c. 2 n. 332. 2 l. 11 c. 3 q. 4 . Preface, question 7, article 7, note 4, page 10. P. Milante in the treatise on the proper doctrine, proposition 60. Exercise 35. Wigandt tr. 13 num. 98 et c. cap. 5 n. 68 cum Prima pars est contra primam sententiam dicentem, quod recidivi debeant absolvi semper ac ad Sacramentum accedunt.

And it is proven from what he said: For a penitent who has the habit of sinning against the law of God, nature, or the Church, there appears to be no hope of amendment; neither should absolution be denied nor postponed until he openly expresses his sorrow and proposes amendment. The reason is, because, as Con Cap. I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. A penitent may be absolved by one who is 585 fessarius in measure; he must be morally certain about his disposition; hence, although a sinner confessing for the first time should be considered disposed (as we have said), because no presumption against him obstructs this, yet, when he has already been admonished in another Confession and has fallen again in the same manner without any effort made or means prescribed by the Confessional fulfilled, frequent relapse gives a sign, or at least suggests prudent suspicion that his penitence is not genuine: for one who firmly proposes to himself (as Lugo says on day 14, note 160) something morally possible for him, does not so easily forget his purpose, but at least perseveres in it for some time and falls more difficultly or less frequently.

Herefore S. Isidorius l. 2. Sentenç. c 16 sic ait: Ille poenitentiam dignè agit, qui sic præterita mala deplorat, ut futura iterum non committat. And St. Augustine says in the same place. Isidore thus wrote excellently: He who beats his breast and does not correct himself, strengthens sins rather than removes them. Therefore St. Charles (In Act.

The Synod rightly taught: The absolution is to be postponed for those who have persevered in the same sins for many years and have labored but have not been corrected. And he says in the aforementioned place: It is possible to presume this to occur in the confession of venial sins, in which the penitent is habituated. For although the Doctors commonly say that those who lapse again in the same venial sins can more easily be absolved, because their occasions are more frequent and there is not so strict an obligation to avoid them; nevertheless, it is rightly said 229 n. 112, that one should often fear lest the Confessions of such persons become null and sacrilegious, who have conceived a purpose too broadly to avoid the preaching of venial sins to be avoided. He rightly observed that such penitents, rather than vexing themselves, should attentively attend to those keys which they know ought to be applied to all their venial sins,

from which they truly feel pain and in which they have a firm resolve. They say however.

Lugo, ... or other places, c. namely that even though these things do not prevent it, a recidivist can properly be absolved up to the third or fourth time. Volume Three Eight Six Chapter. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. in turn, even if he has relapsed in the same manner and has employed no remedy. I reverence the authority of so many DD., but I have never been able to acquiesce in their opinion; for although the penitent has already been admonished in another Confession and has relapsed in the same manner without applying any effort towards amendment, the same suspicion recurs that it is not possible for the Confessor to have a sufficient certitude of his moral disposition with regard to this Sacrament, as will be explained below. The second part, however, is against the second opinion, which asserts with an intolerable rigor that a habitual sin can never be absolved unless long experience establishes its amendment. The reason for our opinion is that the relapsed individual, although he does present some suspicion, yet does not exhibit a certain sign of disposition; for it can well happen that the penitent truly had a firm will not to relapse, and yet be relapsed by the force of an evil habit, as Anselmus (in Simil. c. 189.) d.censures, observing that those who are ensnared by an improper custom, unwillingly do not fall into the same vices. Wherefore whenever the penitent brings forth signs of extraordinary sorrow, through these the suspicion of indisposition is removed, and then the Confessor can prudently judge that his penitent is sufficiently disposed.

Wherefore truly says P. Milante in proposition 60. condemn. by Innoc. XI. Above mentioned in tome one, page 386, that there is not absolutely excluded any such consuetudinarius whatsoever, but rather he who gives no hope of amendment. Therefore, the consuetudinarius who gives some hope of amendment; provided that this be solid and founded, can be absolved. But many authorities of the Holy Scriptures. Fathers, which adversaries bring forward, prove nothing else than that great difficulty which exists in both contracting and removing an evil habit; but well does Lugo teach d. 14 n. 166. cum.

Reg. Henry and others commonly hold that a sufficient Disposition consists in present sorrow and purpose, not in future amendment, and that he who is penitent will be able to be absolved, even though it may be judged that he will relapse. It is also not true that sole temporal proof constitutes a unique sign of contrition. Doubt. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 58r through the change of will; for the alteration of will depends on divine grace, which does not require time but operates in the instant, and thus it can be disclosed not only by the experience of time but also by other signs presumed otherwise. Nay, sometimes other signs of this present disposition much better manifest the change of will than does the experience of time; for those signs directly indicate the disposition of the penitent, whereas experience indicates it only indirectly; so that it often happens, as Gregory says, that someone may long maintain himself outwardly in accordance with the honor of this present world and yet not be rightly disposed. Therefore, whenever the penitent brings true signs of sorrow and purpose, so often can he be properly absolved, as clearly gathered from c. Sep- ties 23, dist. 3, where D. Hieronymus says thus: "The just man falls seven times." If he falls, how is the just man? If he is just, how does he fall?

But the just man retains the name "just," who always rises through penance. Not only seven times, but seventy-seven times to him who has sinned sevenfold, if he turn to penance, are sins given. And in Decretum 14 in 2 ad Causam he wrote: I do not seek delay of time, but correction of the soul; therefore demonstrate this, whether they be penitent, whether they be improved for the better, and then the whole matter is completed. Hence the Author of the Book edited in Rome, whose title (Instructio per li Novelli) says thus: If relapse arises from one's own frailty without any other extrinsic voluntary and almost rash cause, it is temerity to say that every relapsed person is indisposed. And thus in c. 9 n. 213 he says, that a relapsed sinner on account of the force of evil habits should be absolved at once, if he have a firm will to apply means to himself for amendment: and he adds: Let us judge, that otherwise it would be too rigorous; and that by doing so the Confessor would transgress the true spirit of the Church, and of the Lord, and of the nature of the Sacrament, which is not only judgment, but also a salutary medicine.

But you will ask, what are these signs of extraordinary 46th pain, with which the relapsed individual can immediately be absolved? Various such signs are transmitted by the AA. above at chapter 388. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. Of these, the places cited are namely: I. The major pain is disclosed through tears, sighs, or heartfelt words, says Lugo, Layni. With the consent. Lohner, Renzi, et alium dicit autem Gonettus 1. 4 c. 5 q. 19, non esse saepè credendum lacrymis peccatorum, nam saepè lacrymæ proveniunt ab humano affectu. In place of not frequently, rather this Author should have said not always; for truly, as well says P. Milante, such tears, especially in women and the uneducated, are not always signs

of true penitence; for sometimes they arise from some passion which the penitents display; or from a motive of denied absolution, or of damage suffered or imminent danger.

However, tears of penitents, especially those that arise from the compunction of the heart, are most abundantly produced when they flow eagerly at some word or admonition of the Confessor which offers a motive for compunction. Herefrom St. Leo, Epistle 82. Theodor. (Bishop) thus taught: In dispensing God's gifts, we must not be difficult, nor neglect the tears and groans of those accusing themselves, since we believe that the very affection for penitence is conceived from divine inspiration. Note that since we believe, therefore orderly, unless otherwise is perceived, a penitent must be believed to shed tears from the inspiration of God.

Here it makes presumptuous that which we brought forward above from D. Joannes Chrysostomi, where he said that compunction is a sign of true sorrow. II. Minor humerus peccatorum, ut dicunt Busemb. Wigaudt, laym:, Laym: Sporer, Anacl. P. Segneri, Lohner, Gob.

Mazzotta, . Tamen hoc intelligendum est, cum pœnitens fuerit in eisdem occasionibus et tentationibus peccandi: aut si ille post ultimam Confessionem diu se continuerit, v.g., per 20 vel 30 dies, cum antea assuetus fuerit prolabi pluries in hebdomada: vel si relapsus fuerit post magnum conflictum, ut rectè ajunt Croix et Anacl. III. Study directed toward emendation: Lugo, Mazzotta; or if the penitent shall have employed fastings, almsgivings, prayers, and Masses, that he might do good, according to Cap. I. Doubt. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 589 And to prepare himself for Confession and for Absolution. Spontaneous flight from occasions; Croix, and Mazotta. Completion of the prescribed means from the confessional: Wiggand, Busenb., and Mazza.otta. IV. If a penitent seeks means to amend himself; or has previously offered better execution of those already given; Lugo, Segneri, Croix and Maz.; especially (says Lugo) if he has never been admonished about the use of such means; but I do not think that such promises should be entirely relied upon, since penitents easily promise to fulfill all that the confessor imposes for absolution, but they often neglect them afterward.

V. Si pœnitens anteà præstita melius execu- turum; Lugo, Segneri, Croix et Maz.; maximè (ait Lugo) si numquàm admonitus fuit de mediis adhibendis; sed hujusmodi promissionibus puto non omnino finden- dum, cum poenitentes facile promittant, ad absolutio- nem obtinendam, se omnia

executuros, quæ Confessa- rius imponit, sed non raro posteà negligunt. Spontaneous Confession, as they say. Segneri; provided that the penitent does not confess out of obligation to the Paschal precept, or prompted by parents, a pedagogue, or a master; nor on account of some custom of confessing certain sins on particular Feasts, namely the Nativity of the Lord and the Assumption. V. And as regards Mary, etc., let it altogether come spontaneously, and by true divine inspiration; solely that he may acquire God's grace, this very spontaneous confession would be a sign of disposition, if the penitent, wishing to approach the Sacrament, had made notable exertion, namely, he had undertaken a long journey, refrained from gain on that day, overcome great internal or external conflict, and similar things.

VI. If he accedes prompted by some extraordinary motive, namely a notable sermon, the death of some friend, or fear such as an earthquake, eruption, pestilence, etc., P. Milante and Croix. VII. If the penitent confesses the sins previously culpably omitted; Croix. VIII Si poenitens priusquam accedit, restituuerit ablatum, vel reparaverit famam proxime laesam.

Milante, IX. I add with Milante, that if after sins a penitent signifies to the Confessor's admonition that he has acquired through new knowledge an awareness of his own iniquity, or apprehended the danger of his own damnation anew. It is added as presumptuous a sign of extraordinary things, if the penitent say that he has immediately repented after sinning, if he wishes to satisfy himself, if great repentance be accepted with a good mind, if he protests from his own conscience. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. It would rather prefer death to relapse. I say these signs can scarcely merit the ability to assist in other signs of disposition. These signs of disposition for recidivism, however, the aforementioned authors did not transmit by chance, but through experience of the learned. Wherefore I think that he does not err at all who directs himself according to commonly received opinions from such and such DDs, not possessing notable notes.

Tamen dicere quod ipsi scripserint passione affecti ut suæ doctrinæ cum plausu exciperentur vel propter aliquid hujusmodi non videtur carerre aliquid labe temeritatis. Quod si hoc non sit censendum, non debet credi, haec tam graves DD. à Deo luce sua in re quac directionem respicit conscientiarum totius populi Christiani fuisse destitutos; tantò magis quod circa tales sententias nulla Ecclesiae proscriptio intercesserit. It does not matter that many opinions, which are prevalent, are not condemned by the Church and yet are commonly regarded as lax; for the Church does not

condemn all opinions which regard particular cases, although it does not approve them; but it neither approves nor remains silent regarding sentences which regard the universality of consciences. The Church tolerates much concerning matters of faith and a good life, and yet it neither approves nor remains silent. Regarding this matter, I return to the proper subject with certainty. That the Confessor be held to defer absolution until he is morally certain of the disposition of his penitent, either by means of the experience of time, or through some means, provided that the penitent as yet does not offer sufficient signs of his disposition. But it must be noted (as we said regarding the Gen. Sacraments n. 57), that in other Sacraments, since the matter is physical, a physical certainty is required; but in this Sacrament of Penance, since the matter is moral, because the acts of penance are involved, it suffices that there be a moral certainty, or respective certainty.

Thus did Our Lord Thomas teach in I. 2. quæst. 91 art. 3 ad 3: it is not necessary that every measure be altogether infallible... but according to what is possible within its own genus. And 2. 2 question 47 Chapter I. Doubt. II. Concerning the essence of this Sacrament. 5g1 ar. 9 ad 2 Certitude is not to be sought in the same manner in all things, but in each particular matter according to its own mode; for since matters of prudence are singular contingent things concerning which human operations occur, certitude of prudence cannot be so great that solicitude is entirely removed.

Wherefore, concerning our purpose, it is sufficient that the Confessor have a prudent probability regarding the disposition of the penitent, and that there be no reasonable suspicion otherwise; otherwise, very few could be absolved, since whatever signs of penitence do not provide more than a probable indication of disposition, as rightly teaches P. Suarez de Poenit. d. 32 s. 2 n. 1, where he says that it is necessary and sufficient for the Confessor to prudently and probably judge the penitent to be disposed. And this seems to be sufficiently expressed in the Catechism 60, where it is said: If in Confession (the Priest) has judged that neither diligence in enumerating sins nor the pain of contrition of the penitent was entirely lacking, he can absolve. Therefore always and positively, if the penitent has completely lacked sorrow, the Confessor cannot absolve him; he himself can absolve. Hence the Author in the aforementioned citation (Instruzioni per gli Li Novissimi) thus speaks in the Esparsa: Wherefore we firmly believe that for the administration of Penance nothing is to be sought other than a prudent and probable judgment concerning the disposition of the penitent. Wherefore if the circumstances do not found a prudent doubt that he is not sufficiently disposed, the Confessor ought not to trouble himself nor the penitent for having the evidence that it is

impossible.

And this is brought by the text in c. A nobis 2 de Sentent. Excom. ubi dicitur: Judicium Dei veritatis, quae non fallit nec fallitur semper innititur; judicium autem Ecclesiæ nonnumquam opinionem sequitur, quam et fallere saepè contingit et falli. It is certain and common among all, that a confessor should always and prudently judge it expedient to defer absolution to a presumptuous penitent both disposed and undesiring his consent, considering such delay useful for his amendment. Thus Chapter 392 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. Lugo d. 14 n. 168. Cross n. 1764. 13.

Carden in the same place with Suarez, Sa, Ratio: because penitents, although they have a right to absolution on account of the completion of confession, nevertheless do not have the right that it be immediately absolved; for the confessor, to whom not only the judge's but also the presumptively medical duty is committed, can well, and indeed in my judgment (as I said above) is bound to defer absolution when he judges such a remedy to be necessarily useful for the salvation of his penitent. A great doubt arises: whether it is more expedient frequently to employ this remedy of deferred absolution, or not, since the penitent has already sufficiently prepared himself for absolution without his consent? It is commonly held according to D.D., in no way is it expedient to defer absolution when the delay is more prejudicial than beneficial; thus 60 censure from Inuoc. XI ret Lugo d. 14 n. 168. 1. 2 c. 33 n. 45. et Mazzotta t. 3 p. 577 cum aliis communiter. The same must be said, because on account of the delay in absolution the penitent would suffer a note of infamy, as Croix n. 1764 and Mazzotta 1 c. cum 455. Outside these cases, Hurtado always considers it expedient to defer absolution according to custom; but Concina p. 719 n. 19 and Juvenin, and Merbes in the same place say that such a remedy is necessary itself, so that by those very works he may confirm his conversion.

Quintino Juvenin in suo opere de hoc rigidissimè loquitur: Qui mortaliter peccaverunt, non debent absolvi, nisi ad viri prudentis judicium tempore operibus conversionem probrint..... Totius antiquitatis persuasum fuit, contritionem non esse unius diei opus, sed multorum mensium, imò et nonnumquam annorum: Et in Instit. 3 addit, hoc servandum esse, etiamsi pœnitens semel paraverit aliquod enor- Cap. I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 595 my sin, as perjury, adultery, murder, and similar offenses. Speaking however of a habituated sinner, he says, "Never is he considered disposed for absolution unless his conversion through

amendment has been proven for a long time."

Others, however, as Busembaus infra dub. 5 n. 1., are condemned by Innoc. 60 dam. ab. XI. The Decretals, d. 10, dub. 29 Croix, n. 1768. . 5 n: 67. etc., say that rarely is it expedient for the absolution to be deferred from a penitent who has been disposed for repentance. It is better said that a certain rule cannot be observed in this case; rather, the Confessor should direct himself according to circumstances that occur and, after having commended himself to God, so as to be inspired by God, he should either defer absolution or impart it. Whereupon wisely the Bishops of Belgium gathered in Brussels decreed in their Constitution to their own people in the year 1697 as follows:

The Confessor does not demand that any gravely sinful or even recurrent sins be expiated by notable works of penance for a previous period of time; but rather, with the SS. Let the Fathers expend, in the conversion of the sinner, more on considering the measure of sorrow than the time. See ap. Cross L. 6 p. 2 n. 1824. That is why I say that, if a penitent has relapsed due to a cause or intrinsic weakness, as happens in sins of pollution, sluggish delight, hatred, blasphemy, and similar ones; I rarely think that absolution, sufficiently prepared for by the sign of an extraordinary sacrament, should be deferred.

And in the case where a delay seems advisable (whatever Juvenin and Merbes may say, demanding a delay of months or even years), it is more accurate to say that absolution should not be deferred for more than eight or ten days, as stated by the Author of the book titled "To Bishop D. Julio Torto," in which reference is made to Louis. Habert in Praxi S. Poenit. tr. 4 p. 417) et ab alio Auctore jam citato (libri Instru. per li Novelli Et §94 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

The Sacrament of Penance is favored by this N. SS. P. Ben. XIV. in his letter. Ency. quæ incipit, Apostolica, (ut et animos addant, ut ante reditus ea, quae illis agenda præscribuntur, rite perficiant; ex quo fiat, ut ad Sacramentale forum regressi ab absolutionis beneficio donentur. I say in summary, that absolution may be deferred until as late as fifteen days.

I said: if the penitent has relapsed through an intrinsic cause; for if he has relapsed through an extrinsic occasion, I say that absolution must be altogether deferred until the occasion is removed, provided it is voluntary; but if it is necessary, until the danger of relapsing from a proximate cause is made remote. And in this regard, ordinarily speaking, certainly a delay of 10 or 15 days is not sufficient. (See what we said about this point

above, n. 452.) Question. III.) I said rarely, namely, that it is not to be departed from the common sentence, which are transmitted in 2 c. 32 n. 45, regularly ceuseo, non discedendum à sententia communi. Lugo d. 14 n. 106.

Fill. tr. 7. 20 n. 3. Dicast. d. 10 dub. 29. Croix n. 1822 cum communi ut asserit, Sporer c. 2 n. 130: "5 c. 13 nempe non esse differendam absolutionem poenitenti, qui relapsus est ex intrinseca fragilitate, quia in tali poenentie magis sperandum, profuturam fore gratiam Sacamenti, quam dilationem absolutionis." But you will say, why should the absolution be deferred for the penitent who is in an extrinsic occasion of sin, and not for him who has relapsed through slight habit, since the same extrinsic occasion urges to sin as does a bad habit? Response: In a very different manner does an extrinsic occasion impel to sin as compared with a vicious habit; for an extrinsic occasion, through the presence of the object, which excites lively thoughts, powerfully moves senses inclined towards sin, and makes the affection towards sin more intense. It excites lively thoughts, powerfully moves senses inclined towards sin, and makes the affection towards sin more intense; and therefore the penitent should take upon himself the greatest force, not only to overcome temptation, but also to strive, so that the danger may be avoided. Cap. I.

Doubt. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. By fleeing familiarity with the person of the accomplice let it be made remote from the proximate. However, an erroneous custom, since it does not have a present extrinsic object, does not so much impel the occasion for sinning; hence, it follows that the penitent should incur less severity upon himself to abstain from sin. Furthermore, since evil dispositions are something intrinsic and inseparable from the person, their eradication depends less on the removal of occasions than on one's own will; and thus it is more to be hoped that God will assist good will to persevere through greater aids.

Postulans haec, confessor imprudenter agit si absolvit eum qui est in occasione extrinseca, saltem antequam per fugam illud periculum remotur; nam alioqui eum reliquit in probabili periculo infringendi propositum, quia talis poenitens post obtentam absolutionem facile neglegens fuga necessario adhibenda, sic sine dubio relapsurus est. On the contrary, prudently is the recidivist absolved on account of an intrinsic cause, if he is truly disposed by a sign of extraordinary sorrow, because the danger in him of infringing his purpose is more remote, since on one side there does not exist an extrinsic cause impelling to sin, and on the other greater assistance from God will be given to the penitent for extirpating the evil habit which is present unwillingly and detested; hence it is more hoped that he will be amended by the help of grace in the received Sacrament

than by delay of absolution. "Often" helps (says the learned P La Croix, who treats this matter of the Sacrament of Penance excellently), "reabsolution of relapsing penitents is beneficial, both on account of the aids of grace which the Sacrament imparts and because to whom it can be administered with pious exercises will have greater efficacy from the Sacrament, and they will be more pleasing to God." Greater and more efficacious, inasmuch as they are done by an friend of God, and according to the institution of Christ, there inheres a greater satisfactive power to them; then is there a presumptuous hope of being more fervently used according to the precepts prescribed, for delay offends, because they do not return, but are rendered obdurate through protraction. This is approved by : Dicendum quod majus 396 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, a remedy is provided against avoidable sins, from Grace, as much as from the habit of our works. Hence rightly is it said at the end: Why should one hope for better relief from the fact that a sinner lacks grace through delay, than from the fact that one has been constituted in friendship with God through absolution? And especially concerning the sin of pollution, Toledo I, 5, c. 13 says thus: "I hardly think that there is a more efficacious remedy than frequently adhering to confession; for this is the greatest Sacrament. He who does not use this, let him not promise himself amendment except by miracle." We read concerning frequent confession as a remedy for those fallen into such vice, that Dominic Philip Neri (in his Life, c. 6, n. 2) made especially great use of it. And to this doctrine refers that which is found in the Roman Ritual concerning the Sacrament.

Pœnit., ubi: In peccata facile recidentium utilissimum fuerit consulere, ut sæpè confiteantur, et si expediat, communicent. Therefore, the Ritual, when it says that frequent confession is a most useful remedy for those easily falling into sin, presupposes that an evil habit has not been entirely removed from them; but, on this account, it teaches that the grace of the Sacrament greatly contributes to amendment. Certain persons addicted to rigidity, who through a single channel of rigor conduct souls, speaking excessively generally, assert that all recidivists become more perverted, when they are absolved before they are amended. But I have asked these my masters, whether those who, lacking grace of the Sacrament and being released without absolution, become all the more powerful recidivists and are amended? How many wretched ones have I myself come to know, who, cast down by the denial of absolution, fell into despair, and for many years were estranged from the Sacraments?

However, each one should direct himself regarding the withholding or deferring of absolution according to the light given him by God. This is

certain, that both those who are too lenient and those who are too strict in absolving err in this matter; both extremes are pernicious; for many confessors, through excessive leniency in absolving, lead more souls to perdition; but others, through undue rigidity, do the same. Dub. HL De essentia hujus Sacamenti. The excessive rigidity is no less detrimental. Wherefore I do not know whether in the confessional you should feel less scruple in absolving the indisposed than in dismissing the disposed.

Finally, in order to expose my conscience's opinion, I conclude thus: At some time, a delay in absolution might profit someone who has recidivated. Indeed always will it profit to deter such recidivists from their intrinsic frailty by threatening them with the negation of absolution. Ordinarily however speaking, it would profit them more to receive absolution, when disposed they approach through the sign of extraordinary sorrow. Would that I and all confessors would absolve recidivists, since they bring to them only extraordinary signs! But what is to be lamented is that the greatest part of confessors from everywhere, having shown no sign whatever of extraordinary sorrow, are always absolving such relapses without any admonition and without offering any remedy; and thus it is from such cases that the ruin of so many souls proceeds. ## DUBIUM III. ## What kind of confession is required? ## ARTICULUS I. ## Whether an integral confession should be made materially? 465 What is meant by material integrity? 466 How far does the number extend, when we say more or less?

And how is the number to be inquired about in a customary matter? Are the circumstances aggravating necessarily to be explained? I. How many opinions are there in this question? Is the quantity to be explained in theft? (See this at the end). 469 Dub. 1. Does aincest with consanguines differ in species from incest with affines? 470 Dub. 2.

Whether the degrees of consanguinity in incest with consanguineous individuals should be explained in sin? 471 Various matters to note around Examination of conscience and the integrity of Confession. 472 Whether doubtful mortal sins must necessarily be confessed? 473 Dub. I. Are we bound to confess mortal sins positively as doubtful? Doubtful. II. Are negative mortal doubts to be held as dubious? 598 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. 475 What if someone wishes to receive the Eucharist? 476 What if someone is scrupulous or has a timid conscience? 477 Doubt 3. Whether one is bound to confess some mortal sin in doubt, or whether that has been confessed, is a question. 478 Dub. 4.

Whether he who has confessed a mortal sin as doubtful is to be considered as having repeated it when he knows it to be certain? What if the penitent, after Confession, should know that he has omitted the matter of his sin: it is grave, but himself in no way would have known at the time when he committed the sin? 465 "You confess all mortal sins occurring to memory, not yet confessed, and their number and circumstances which change their appearance." This is evident from the context and is certain. The reason is, because otherwise the sacramental judgment could not be rightly administered, "nor could justice be observed in the imposition of penalties." It is said i. By itself, and ordinarily: because by happening [accidens], it suffices formally by extraordinary means; by ordinary means, integrity is sufficient. v. dub. "seq." 466 "It is said twice, understand certain, which, if it does not consist, take as probable, adding more minus." Which is, si afterwards you discover that you have erred, you are not held to confess again, unless a notable greater fault has occurred.

Fagun. et Sa, who say that those words extend only to one or two above the indicated number * (Lugo d. 16 nu. 97. Cabbas. T. J. c. X numerum VIII. They say that this is to be taken thus: "Circe three times, understood twice or four times: Circe ten, understood eight; or perhaps Circe thirty, twenty-seven or thirty-three." Circè centum, 95 et 105.

Circè mille, 950 et 1050.)* But although this is true in a small number, it does not hold for the denario or indeed for the centenario, millenarius, etc., because those words do not have an absolute sense, but a respective one, according to the number to which they are added, the greater that number being, so also greater are those words. Cap. I. Dub. II. On the essence of this Sacrament. 599 It is understood provided that it be small in comparison to the other to which it is joined; this must be estimated by prudent discretion. Thus » Likewise, Cardinal de Lugo, in the sixteenth question of the ninety-fourth distinction.

If however it cannot even be deemed probable, then it must be said that habitual sin is to be considered in terms of opportunity for sinning, time, and frequency per day, week, month, or year. V. Diana page 3, treatise 4, rubric 94.9, difference 5. Lugo » distinction 16 note 79. » Benè he advises 451.

I am not obliged to make a confessor excessively anxious and troubled in seeking the exact number of sins in a habitual penitent, because it is often impossible to have such a certain number; for many respond a hundred or a thousand times only by divination; but who will prudently grant them

credit? Wherefore better will the Confessor act if he diligently inquire about the state of conscience; and thence, by questioning the penitent concerning his lapses more or less in a day, or week, or month, at least in a confused number of sins committed during habitual practice, so as not to form a certain judgment with danger of error. « It is said 3rd, that which mutates species: because although it be probable, according to some and others, that those things which notably aggravate the same species (that is, which exceed the ordinary mode of sinning according to each one's conscience) should be explained, yet by reason drawn in the response; nevertheless the contrary opinion, » which from . Good. Lugo d. 16 s. 3, etiam probabilis est, et tuta: saltem si excipias 1. Degrees of consanguinity in fornication.

The quantity of theft, injury, etc., which requires satisfaction. When one act results in the killing of several, or their infamy, or among several. 4. Hatred is prolonged; because then it is wont to occur more frequently. See Regin. 1. cit. * (Diuturna odium, congruent etiam concupiscentia carnalis in mulierem necessario sunt exprimenda in Confessione, non tam ratione circumstantiae aggravantis, quam propter numerum peccatorum. VI. Vide Regin. 1. cit. * (Odium diuturnum, congruent etiam concupiscentia carnalis in mulierem necessario sunt ex praemenda in Confessione, non tam ratione circumstantiae aggravantis, quam propter numerum peccatorum.)

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. "Of those sins which might have intervened in that prolonged delay, as they say, see what is stated in book 5 on Sin, nos. 37." * 5. Peccatum inter Confessarium et poenitentem.

See Filius de impedimento matricis cap. 5 quaestio 5. 6. If the circumstances assail the censure, or the reservation, or if the confessor prudently interrogates the penitent concerning the necessary direction for the penitent's confession. It queries. 1. Whether the notable aggravating circumstances of mortal sins are necessarily to be confessed? There are three opinions, all greatly probable.

The first opinion affirms this, and they hold thus: 22 s. 3 n. 5. Soto in four divisions, eighteen questions, two parts, chapter twenty-three. Gonet Genett. t. 4 c. 6 q. 3. Cross 1. 6 p. 2 number 977. Antoine page 504.

Vigandt tr. 3 n. 26 item Estius, Canus, Heur. c. 8 n. 22 et Alens. Sylv. Cajetan 7 Response 1. It is proven from the Roman Ritual concerning the Sacrament. Penance: Si dicitur: Quod si paenitens numerum, speciem et

circumstantias necessarias explicandi non expresserit, sacerdos eum interroget.

Therefore not only are circumstances that change the species to be explained, but also those notably aggravating; for this is what the words "species" and "circumstances" signify. This is confirmed by the Catechetical reason, because the same reason which recommends that circumstances changing the species be carefully considered also urges with equal force regarding those notably aggravating the circumstances; for both kinds of judgment of the Confessor notably change. Neither does it cause offense, for as P. Suarez responds, the Council merely wished to define that which was certain, while this very question it has left indecisive in the opinion of Theologians. The second opinion, which Sporer holds in Pœn. c. 3 § 3 nu. 410 citing for himself . . . , says that it is necessarily to be confessed a circumstance as stated in Chapter I. Dub.

III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 401 What, namely, touches the substantial integrity of the individual sin insofar as it is the quantity of theft; Why because otherwise the Confessor will not be able to formulate a fitting judgment regarding the substance of the sin. The third opinion appears more probable to me in negating that there is an obligation to confess aggravating circumstances, and this is held by the SS. Concerning the third part of the lit. E.

St. Bonaventure in the fourth question, seventeen decrees, third article, second part, third section. Soto in 4. Decretum 17, quaestio una. Caa-bassut. Theor. etc. . 23 d. un. p. q. Bon. qu. 5 s. 2 p. 2 § c diff. 3 n. 5.

Tolet. 1. 3 c. 7 nu. 7. 16 sectio 3 cum Scoto, putant regularem et probabilem c. n. 15. You ask, and many others with you cite: It is proven I, from 16 questions, question 3, article 2, quies 5. He has indeed contributed great weight to this opinion through his authority; yet it is necessary to transcribe the entire text of this passage in order that it may be clear that Saint Doctor certainly taught this; there he teaches thus: for some say that one must confess all circumstances which add a notable quantity to sin, if they come to mind. Others say that it is not necessary to confess unless circumstances which lead to another kind of sin are acknowledged: and this is more probable; but it must be added that those which lead to a different species of mortal sin: for the reason being that venial sins are not necessarily of necessity confessed, but only mortal sins, which in some way have an infinite quantity: and because aggravating circumstances do not belong to another kind of sin, nor indeed do they belong to mortal sin if they do; yet it is more perfect to confess them, and thus the same statement is congruent with remission of venial sins.

Commonly they agree A. A.

D. Thomas in hoc loco nostram sententiam tenuisse, et signanter Canus in 55q ubi ait: B. Thomas expressly holds, solecisms alone Lib. 4. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. Confess those constants which specifically change. The same is felt by St. Augustine, as we shall see below. The same is said by Sotus ap. Juvenin. loco. cit. p. 468 ubi dicit: D. Soti non vero sententia D. Thomae. Nevertheless, the Doctor does not speak there about those circumstances which add the malice constituting a mortal sin, but about those which do not cross the boundaries of a venial sin; and he deduces this from the reason which St. Thomas adds there: Whence the reason is that venial sins are not of necessity subject to Confession, but only mortal sins, which in some way possess an infinite quantity.

Concerning so great a man's indulgence, it does not seem that this interpretation has place; for it is answered that what question T. Th. there proposes is signally about circumstances which add some notable quantity to the sin: but that notable quantity cannot be understood concerning a venial sin, but only concerning a mortal sin, a premeditation, because no one ever doubted this; for who would say or could be thought to have said that the circumstances of a venial sin are necessarily to be confessed, since among all it is common knowledge that venials are not de rigueur in confession? Secondly, because D. Thomas speaks there of circumstances which add a notable quantity to the sin, this however necessary notable quantity must be understood as referring to the circumstance of a mortal sin, and not to a venial sin. And that this be the case is clearly evident from the reason which the Sacred Doctor subsequently gives, namely, that venial sins are not de rigueur for Confession; and this reason no longer regards its principal sense, as it understands it. P. Conc., namque non oportet confiteri circumstantias notabiliter aggravantes, utpote quia sunt venialia; sed respicit illud: Addendum est (quod immediate praecedit), qua ad aliam spectem peccati mortalis trahunt. By these words openly D. [does not] truly encompass circumstances Chapter I.

Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 405 instances of venial sin; even though they are of diverse species, and it explains this reason, namely that venial sins are not of necessity of Confession. Then this is further clarified by adding: And because circumstances that aggravate but do not assign another species to the sin, or which do assign a different species but not (noted) of mortal sin, are not necessary to Confession. Therefore, the Holy Doctor distinguishes between circumstances which confer a different species but do not constitute mortal sin, and between

circumstances which do not confer a new species (that is to say, mortal sin, so that without doubt it would have been compared a venial sin with venial sins), and he calls both kinds of circumstances non-essential to Confession.

Here St. Anthony speaks, § 7. Following D. Thomas, he says: And those very circumstances which draw the sin into another species, it is necessary to confess according to St. Thomas; otherwise, to confess circumstances which are not venial of necessity for confession is a matter of perfection and not necessary. Then, after having explained other kinds of circumstances, he says: Third are those which involve inconvenience, such as stealing a large amount (for example, stealing one hundred florins), which is much more grievous in terms of theft; and these, which aggravate the sin, constitute perfect confession, but since they do not change the species [of sin] nor infinitely aggravate it, it is not necessary to confess them according to Thomas. He adds that Peter of Palude asserts this to be a common opinion. Whereupon Saint Archbishop concludes that only those circumstances should be confessed which change the species and aggravate to infinity, citing the example of theft in a sacred place. It is proven by two reasons.

Reason 1: because thus it is said in V: Those circumstances in confession to be explained, which change the species of sin, for without them sins themselves would neither be fully expounded by the potentates, nor made known to the judges, and it could not happen that they might rightly judge the gravity of crimes, and impose the penalty that ought to be imposed on those who are guilty thereof; by these words it seems that the Council does not obscurely exclude the obligation of confessing other circumstances, which are laid down in the Law. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance: avoiding a semblance; because he says that this is sufficient for this, namely, in order that the Confessor may rightly form a judgment concerning the gravity of sins and the punishment to be imposed.

Reason 2. because otherwise penitents would always fluctuate in distresses, since they could always doubt the integrity of their Confessions, in determining which circumstances are there either not notably aggravating; and therefore he says: c. q. 5 ad 2. A determined quantity cannot be revealed to the Priest, because even the sinner himself cannot write it; hence, it suffices that you know the quantity which arises from the species of the sin. Whereupon Lugo assigns a priori the reason for this judgment, saying that Christ, if He had not otherwise commanded, would have sufficed with confession of sins; but who ever explains the circumstances changing the species of sin already truly confesses and

explains the essence of sin, since the quiddity or essence of sin is taken from its specific nature. Reason 3. because, if we fear to manifest circumstances notably aggravating, we are held presumptuous in confessing notably mitigating circumstances, namely, if anyone has sinned out of anger, fear, more intense passion, through induction by others, and the like; which obligation the presumptuous adversaries deny. The last and strongest reason, as the most learned Cabassutius and Lugo teach, is that no one is bound to observe a doubtful law, as has been proven in I. 1 n. 53 with common Decretals from S: Isidore in c. Erit autem dist. 4 and according to the third law de et c. Thom.

That which is stated in book 14, chapter 3, where it says: No one is bound by a precept of several kinds, except through the medium of knowledge of that precept. But knowledge, as is certain among all, and it teaches the same Decretal: hence, if a law aggravating circumstances in confession be very doubtful, we are not bound by it; and therefore (as Lugo rightly says), Trent did not explain this obligation to aggravate circumstances in confession, because the Council itself could not sufficiently gather that from Christ's words and the institution of the Sacrament. Neither does it hinder that the Roman Ritual makes Chapter I an obligation. Dub. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 405 species to be confessed and explained as necessary circumstances. For it is proper that what at some time has been presumptuously assumed should notably aggravate the obligation to confess circumstances, as rightly say Lugo d. 16 n. 121 and Quoad authority of Catechism opposed, it seems that that is excessively probative, for it seems to impose an obligation to explain circumstances not only aggravating, but also presumptively diminishing, which is incredible; for who ever said that if one were to confess a homicide and remain silent, thereby making it appear as though he had committed it out of vehement passion or in a quarrel, he would thereby make his Confession sacrilegious! Wherefore we must confess that this mind of the Catechism is not sufficiently understood. It does not prevent saying that notable aggravating circumstances ought to be explained so that the Confessor may impose due penance. For Lugo responds well: in penance to be imposed, it is not required to have absolute equality, but merely some kind of proportionality, which can indeed be observed if the species of the sin are made manifest, even though the aggravating circumstances are not fully understood.

Hence, citing the aforementioned passage where he himself formulates this objection, he responds thus: "It suffices that the Priest know the quantity which arises from the magnitude of the sin." It does not hinder to say that the first opinion at least is safer, and therefore ought absolutely to be

observed in matters of the Sacrament according to Prop-1 damn. ab Inn. XI. For well do Cardinal Cere- den respond in the second crisis, d. 2, n. 107, and Croix n. 978, that he who subscribes to the secondary opinion does not expose the Sacrament to the danger of nullity, since for the value of the Sacrament a formally integral Confession suffices, which is already probingly present in the confession of sins, even though the aggravating circumstances are not explained. Whereupon it is inferred that any probable opinion denying some sins to differ in species does not incur damnation, because, even if perhaps before God it is false, nevertheless already there exists a formal and complete confession.

Hence S. Anton. says there, Lugo, d. 16, a. 12, and . 8 a06 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. n. 23. When it is said in and of itself, namely, because otherwise, since most likely the Confessor should inquire about the quantity of the theft, so that he may know how to proceed regarding the absolution to be given and the obligation of restitution to impose; thus most likely the penitent is bound to confess the circumstance of the quantity in the theft.

II. Whether he who has committed incest should explain the quality and gravity thereof? These two matters turn on doubt: Doubt is present. Does an incestum with consanguines differ in species from an incestum with affines? Lessius affirms I. 4 c. 3 n. 79.

Roncaglia de sexto. Preface, c. 5, q. 2, Croix, l. 6, p. 2, n. 1074, and others. Reason: since they say that although all kinds of incest violate the same due reverence to blood, yet there is a difference in deformity between incest with consanguineous relatives and incest with affines; for the relationship among consanguineous relatives arises from an intrinsic bond, namely from the identity of the same blood received by generation, whereas the relationship among affines arises from an extrinsic bond, that is to say, from a union entered into with their own consanguineous relatives. However, others more probabily deny that there is a difference between incest with consanguines and incest with affines, as Lugdunum 16n.313 and 316. Sancti de Matrimonio, dec. 16, n. 7 et 8.

Just as in Method. 2, qu. 154 art. q., Ratio quia (as Lugo says) materially regards itself, that is, whether the conjunction be with a consanguineous person or from marriage, since for the same reason copulation with consanguineous persons is prohibited, just as with affines. And for this opinion there is no doubt: in the second question, 154, article 9, paragraph two, where it teaches thus: An affinal person is joined to someone on account of a consanguineous person connected thereto; and consequently, because one is for the sake of the other of the same kind, consanguinity

and affinity cause an inconvenience. However, I think that incest is to be tolerated between privignum and noverca, as well as between soger and nuera, as Lugo says and indicates in n. 316. Reason, because of the debt of reverence, which is a special motive for Cap. I. Dub.

III. On the essence of this Sacrament. The presumed reason for prohibiting copulation between the mother-in-law and son-in-law, or the father-in-law and daughter-in-law, is the four hundred ninth congress of parents with children. Cognatio autem cum affinibus, extra primum gradum, communis est inter DD esse ejusdem speciei. Doubt is cast. In Confessione sint explicandi omnes gradus incestus commissi cum consanguineis usque ad quartum gradum.

The first opinion affirms both and according to the reason, because there is a special reverence between persons related by consanguinity in the first degree. The same is maintained by Bonaventure according to the Second Sentencia, that only incest with consanguineous relations in the direct and collateral line differs specifically from other degrees of relationship in terms of penalty. As regards the first degree of direct lineal relationship, this opinion seems altogether to be held (contrary to what Lugo in the Penitentiary, d. 16, n. 314, and Conclusion 2 teaches, who explains that it should be understood whether the father sinned with his daughter or the son with his mother, whose guilt has a different malice on account of the special reverence due to the mother). Whether, however, the incestuous act in the direct line differs in the degree of punishment from other acts of the same direct line? Croix affirmat et Majus dubium est, an incestus cum consanguineis in praemo gradu lineæ transversalis, nempe cum fratre aut sorore, differat specie ab aliis gradibus?

They affirm. 5 c. 3 n. 79. Lugo n. 143. 131 et 33, Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1074. et 1. 7 d. 52 n. 11. Reason, because the reverence which is due to brothers or sisters differs in reason from that which is due to other consanguineous relatives; for coitus with a sister seems by very nature itself forbidden. As regards other degrees of kindred, they say 408 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, c. 3i, same place, and to induce a proximate circumstance merely aggravating. The third opinion, which Cajetan holds in S. Th. 2. 2 q.:54 ar. qu. 4 part. 7 n. 11. Pontius cap. 32 n. 3. with Megala, Diana, etc., also Palud.

Arm. Vega, Henr. . Soto, et alii multi apud c. (qui cum Fill. vocat valde probabilem) censet omnes incestus inter consanguines, excepto tantum praemo gradu in linea recta, esse ejusdem speciei. Reason why: quia

excepto primo gradu lineae rectae alii gradus tantum constituunt circumstantiae aggravantem, quam explicandi valde probabile est (ut vidimus supra n. 468) non esse obligationem. Reason which Cajetanus brings forward is, because the conjugal mixing among consanguines, except with parents, is merely tolerated by the Church, and not according to natural law; for formerly it was already permitted for the sons of Adam to copulate with their sisters. It does not hinder to say that whether the malice of such incests arises from natural law or from the prohibition of the Church, they will always sin against this reverence which is due to those who are related; for when the Church commands something, it sets forth the matter of the precept in that species of virtue on account of which it gives that command; and because of the same reverence which is due by blood relation, the Church orders the faithful to abstain from such congresses.

Nam respondentur, quod licet Ecclesia prohibendo commixtionem propinquorum usque ad quartum gradum elevaverit huiusmodi abstinentiam ad virtutem pietatis naturali debita sanguine functis non per hoc tamen effecerit quod propinquitas horum graduum induceret diversitatem specificam naturalis; naturalis enim diversitas specifica graduum tantum est desumpta ex difformitate per se naturali, qua probabiliter non adest inter gradus consanguinitatis (praeter primum lineae rectae ut diximus) magis et minus non. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. It varies the species. And for this opinion there seems to be no doubt (as Thomas does not doubt in 2. 2 q. i54 art. 9 ad 3 where he says: In the commixture of united persons something is found that is by its very nature indecent and repugnant to natural reason, congruent that the commixture should take place between parents and children, whose per se and immediate relationship it is, for children naturally owe honor to their parents... But other persons who are not united with each other in themselves but through order to parents do not have this indecency of themselves; rather, decency or indecency varies regarding this according to custom, and human law, that is, positive divine law.

And the same seems to be taught by St. Augustine (ap.). D. Thom. in eod. art. 9) dicens: Com- mixtio sororum et fratrum quanto fuit antiquior compel- lente necessitate, tanto postea facta est damnabilior religione Ecclesia prohibente. The first opinion is less probable; the second, and the third equally probable, seem to be. For the integrity of Confession there is required a careful examination, for the capacity of the penitent, of time's delay, and of other circumstances. But for this a moderate diligence suffices, which a prudent man employs in difficult affairs, and which learned and cautious speakers habitually use when speaking morally, although someone may think that greater diligence will yield more. Bon.

t.: 1 d. 5 qu. 1. . 5 tr. 6 c. 8.

After this however moderate diligence, one is not bound to consider beforehand the subsequent life; and if anything should occur which seems not to have been explained in the confession, he may persuade himself that it has been mentioned among the rest. To this however, a moderate diligence suffices, which a prudent man employs in difficult affairs, which learned and cautious men habitually employ in moral discourse, even though one may think that he will find more with greater diligence. This examination can be supplied from the confessional, though Suarez reproves this in his Confessions with greater diligence, to the extent that it is almost impossible for someone suddenly asked to remember everything; and only so much should be expected. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It admits in the rudiments *(Note what is found in the margin)*: this in the Catechism 60 where it says: If such men, utterly unprepared, should come to him with the most humane words he would dismiss them, exhorting them that they take some time to reflect on their sins and then return. And if perchance they affirm that they have brought to this matter all their zeal, because it is especially reverend for a priest not once having dismissed them from confession should they not return, they will be heard in particular if they bring some study for amendment of life and can produce it, so that they may accuse their own negligence, which they promise to compensate at another time by accurate meditation. * Whom prudent Sa admonishes with the word. Confession, bona fide confessos non nimis rogandos de confessionibus præteritis, nisi intelligatur aliquid necessarium defuisse.

See R. 8g. * (See dicenda n. 505. » 3. It is not necessary to write down sins, lest they be forgotten, as Bonaventure teaches; rather, Soto says that this should not be done, because of the danger of divulgence... Nevertheless, it is better 4. The confession is invalid if it is incomplete, out of ignorance or negligence morally culpable, as more truly teach Suarez and others commonly, against 5. It does not prejudice the integrity, per se speaking, if someone confesses to another a recent more serious lapse beforehand, and then subsequently admits only venial sins according to the usual order (those who imprudently find this difficult to bear will be prohibited or reproved); unless such an occasion remains in the moral occasion of sinning thereby, or so circumvents it as to sin more freely; for then he will sin gravely, and on account of the defect of attrition the confession will be null.

Thus Filic. . 5 t. 6. Card. de Lugo d. 16 n. 57. » 6. Only those explanations are to be given when circumstances diminish them, which either entirely

remove malice, Chapter I. Dub.

III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 411 Either they make venial from mortal, as through the smallness of matter, inadvertence, etc. (for example, if on Friday unknowingly having eaten flesh); or otherwise notably change the judgment of the Confessor; at least with regard to species. » 7. To preserve the integrity of Confession, mortal sins that are doubtful as to whether they are sins should be treated as doubtful, speaking properly of a doubt in its own right; hence they ought to be disclosed, as Suarez teaches in III p. t. 4 d. 22 sect. 9 n. 7. Sanchez, de Lugo d. 16 n. 63.

Bon. d. 3 qu. 5 sect. 1 part. 2 diff. 4. et alii commun. contra Conin. The reason is, first because sins which are in conscience should be made manifest; but doubts remain as doubts are in conscience: secondly because in the matter of salvation and the medium to this necessary means, that axiom does not have so much place: "It is better for him who possesses than this: In doubt, the safer part should be chosen" (For scruples are excused', and those who for a long time after having committed some sin bring up some doubt, if they usually customarily institute Confession, because it is not a prudent doubt). But if subsequently he receives certain knowledge, that same thing must again be confessed as certain, as the Turretines and Sanchez teach in the first book of Moral Theology chapter 10 number 69. However, Card. de Lugo suggests in d. 16 sect. 2 n. 79 and 92 that this should be done for greater security. V. Tamen dubitat Card. de Lugo d. 16 sect. 2 n. 79 et 92, et suadet id ut securius. Diana par. 3 » tom. 4.

Res. 60 et 107. If a confessed sin is true, and later he doubts whether he has confessed it or not, he is not bound to again confess what remains doubtful. Lugo et Tam-burin. exped. conf. d. 1 c. 1. qui idem censent, etsi postmodùm certò comperiat se non fecisse. But it is advised by Suarez and in his chapter, if anyone confesses alone doubtful sins, he should be advised to add something certain from other confessed matters; but if this cannot be had, he should be absolved under a condition. Therefore, it is asked whether there is an obligation to confess doubtful mortal sins, or those in doubt, if they have been confessed?

Three questions here arise for discussion, exceedingly necessary for practice. The doubt arises: whether we are bound to confess positively doubtful mortal sins, namely if there be probable reasons on both sides that it was a mortal sin, Lib. VI. Draw. IV.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: or perhaps it has not been committed? The first opinion affirms this, and those who hold the Antiprobabilisae opinion also maintain it, saying that in equally probable opinions, the safer course should be followed. However, the second most common opinion denies this, and those hold it. 1. Suar, in III. p. t. IV. d. xxii. sect. ix. num. vi. (ubi hanc tutatur, etiamsi probabilius sit peccatum commissum) Sylvest. v. Confession 2 q. 1 c. 3.

Sylvius in third part, question six, article four, ad three. Roncaglia contra 2 q. 7. Escobar, tractatus 15, nota 182. Bonac. d. 4 qu. 4 part. 1. cum communi, . qu. 4 art. 7 n. 9. (pariter asserens esse communem) Tambur. Methodicus (saying this to be certain among all) Filius tr. 7 c. 4 n. 109.

Diana, part 4, treatise 3, response 5. Sporer from and to . Reason, because each one can lawfully conform himself to a truly probable opinion. However rightly they observe and c. n. 5. with and others, that at the point of death, if one doubts whether he has committed a grave sin or whether he has confessed it, knowing that he never received the Sacrament of Penance after such a sin, then one is bound to avoid the danger of damnation, not now positively dubiously confessing that sin, but rather either to receive sacramental absolution, or at least to elicit an act of contrition. Here you say: Contrition necessarily includes the vow of Confession; whence, although contrition can be made, it is not sufficient.

Holzmann responds n. 462, that contrition in itself has the power to expunge sin, and yet does not entirely eradicate certain mortal sins unless accompanied by a vow of confession; for as long as there is a divine precept commanding such confession, it would not truly be contrite who, being able, would refuse to fulfill this obligation. But this runs its course where there is a certain mortal sin, and hence it is necessary matter for Confession; not however if the sin is doubtful; then indeed, since that is not necessary matter, contrition alone suffices according to Cap. I. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. With a vote of Confession, the venial sins are deleted; thus, doubtful mortal sins are also.

It is doubted 2. Whether we are bound to confess mortal negative doubts? The first opinion more commonly affirms this, and this is held by Busemb., as stated above, c. n. 66. Lugo, d. 16, sect. 2, § 3. cum . et . p. 606, n. 54. Diana paragraph 10 treatise 12 note 2.

Escob. 1. 15 n. 176. . Conf. 1. 2 c. 1 § 3 n. 14. Laym, de Consc. c. 5 § 4 n. 37. 7 R. 1. Sporer n. 392. de ex. 21 quaest. 1 art. 3 ad 3. ubi sic ait: Et similiter periculo se immittit qui de hoc quod dubitat esse mortale negligit

confiteri. Non tamen debet asserere illud esse mortale, sed cum dubitatione loqui et judicium Sacerdotis expectare cujus est discernere inter lepram et leprosum. The reason is, because according to canon 14, chapter 5, it is thus stated: It is necessary for penitents to recite in confession all mortal sins of which they have conscience after diligent inquiry and discussion.

Si ergo ex Concilio confitenda sunt omnia mortalia, quorum conscientia habetur; praesumpta sunt confitenda mortalia dubia, quorum dubia habet conscientia. Reason 2. because the law of Confession is in possession, whence in doubt a sin is to be confessed. Reason 3. because this appears to be universal and an established practice of the faithful; and therefore it is assumed that it has issued from Christ's institution and has been observed up to the present time through tradition. The second opinion denies what Habert holds in his book To. 6 p. 244 q. 6, where he says: He who doubts without a probable reason ought to lay aside that doubt. Coninck. tr. 2 d. 7 dub. 8. n. 459.

March in Trib. tr. 4, tit. 6, q. 5. It is superfluous. Eucharistia, n. 23. Mazzotta, tractatus 1, de doctrina, quaestio 3, caput 5., et probabilem vocat, canonicum n. 37., in fine; qu. 2, articulus 2, n. 7., citans S. Antoninum. Palud. . etc. also Bosq.

Henry Ferrantin. from six parts, two n. 609, which he calls more probable on account of intrinsic reasons. And truly, although the first opinion is very probable and fortified by great authority, this nevertheless [is stated] in book 414, chapter 4. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. The second does not seem to lack its own probability. Reason I., because in the aforementioned location from Trent it is not binding upon penitents except to confess all mortal sins of which they have conscience. It does not say, as they are in conscience, namely either as certain or as doubtful, but of those concerning which they have conscience, which means to have a certain knowledge of the sin; for conscience (as St. Bernard says) is nothing other than the science of the heart and practical judgment about the committed sin. Conscientia autem dubia neque est scientia, neque judicium, sed suspensio judicii; unde minimè dici potest habere conscientiam peccati, qui nullam rationem habet, quod illud commiserit; et sic respondetur prima ratio opposita.

This is confirmed from the same source, where it is added: For it is evident that the Church demands from penitents nothing other than that after each

one has diligently excused himself... he confess those sins in which he remembers having mortally offended his God; and all other sins which do not occur to him on careful reflection are understood as included in this same confession. Therefore, a penitent is not bound to confess venial sins, nor doubtful sins either; for when the Council says that the penitent should confess nothing but mortal sins of which he remembers himself guilty; it is not remembering to doubt, but rather failing to remember, that constitutes doubting. Reason 2. because it is not fitting to impose certain punishment for a doubtful offense: nor in doubt whether the law exists, is there obligation of the law (as wisely says Bcned). XIV. nam licet sit lex confitendi certa mortalia, et ideo qui certus est de mortali commisso, et dubitat negativè (nam si dubitet positivè, mox infra dicemus) tenetur confiteri, non tamen existit certa lex confitendi mortalia dubia. And thus is responded to the reasoning opposed to the sequence.

Nor does it hinder the authority of St. Thomas cited; for there the Holy Doctor speaks reverently not of him who after diligent examination forms his judgment that his sin is dubiously mortal, and thus removes doubt according to the aforementioned rule, namely, that no certain obligation arises where a sin is doubtful; but he speaks of one who is certain, Cap., I. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 415 pertains to its evil action, and it does not know how to discern whether it was mortal or venial; hence, here it is bound to exercise diligence in order to remove doubt; whence, since it cannot remove that doubt, it is bound to adhere to the judgment of the Confessor, whose duty it is to distinguish between venial sin and venial sin: Nor does the practice of the faithful oppose this; for it responds thus; because on this account the faithful commonly confess presumptively positive doubtful sins, of which the obligation of confession most nearly all presumed adversaries do not recognize. Item Holzmann ait, quod praefata praxis fortè sit continuata ex errore, qui non potest inducere consuetudinem obligatoriam.

Hereupon refers Henriq. Chapter I, Title 8, Article 45, Note 2. His view. Euchar. n. 23. et Gran. prop. 3 n. 2. non tenêri ad Confessionem, qui vult communicare, et negativê dubitat, an peccaverit mortaliter; tum quia non magis urget præceptum præmittendi Confessionem Communioni quàm præceptum servandi integitatem Confessionis, utrumque enim est de jure divino; tum quia præceptum Tridentini præmittendæ Confessionis (Huic difficultati aliquis respondere posset cum 1 n. 32 non esse illicitum suscipiendi Sacramenta uti opinione probabili, ad differentiam Sacramenta conferentium qui nequeunt ea ministrare nisi cum sententia tutiori vel saltem moraliter certa; sufficit autem ad Sacramenta suscipienda ut quis accedat probabiliter dispositus. If however anyone is unwilling to use this response, he should say with Holzrn that it is necessary, so as to receive

Communion in that case, according to Lib. 416.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, it is quashed, or may receive sacramental absolution (even though that sin be concealed), so as to remove the obstacle of that sin, if perchance it was present. However, in practice (speaking ordinarilly), Confession of mortal sins is altogether advisable for penitents, both negatively and positively regarding doubts, since this ordinarily contributes to the tranquillity of conscience.

I spoke ordinarily, for scrupulous persons altogether ought to be exempt from the obligation of confessing doubtful sins; for they are bound to admit only certain mortal sins, and concerning which they have certainly never been confessed (see what will be said shortly in doubt 3 seq. at the end), as commonly it is taught, c. 10 n. 85. Henry of Navarre. Also, those who are timid in conscience and do not commonly deliberate gravely about lethal sins should be exempt from the obligation of confessing doubtful mortal sins; for they could reasonably, or even morally, certainly believe that they have not consented, because presumption is taken from common contingencies; thus Croix number 612. 2 q. 2 part. 3 n. 19 and Sayr. 1 n. 615 and the Scholastic translator 13 d. 10 n. 193 say: He who has a sufficiently firm mind in good, certainly never or very rarely consents to any grave matter; and movements of sensuality are repugnant to him; it is not necessary for consent to pertain from every permission or non-resistance immediately; for that disposition of the mind seems to sufficiently remove danger. The reason for this a priori is that he who habitually adheres to God and greatly fears that he might be deprived of divine grace if ever turned away from Him, ought to consider himself as having incurred great strength, so as to despise the remorse of conscience, lest he deliberately cast himself into sin: but this cannot be done unless he certainly perceives the evil, Cap. I. Dub. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 417 what it encompasses, for as the most learned Father Alvarez says (according to Croix, lib. i n. 547): The full consensus in mortal sin is such an immense injustice that it cannot be concealed or ignored, but rather can easily be recognized in recent times. Herefore the Lord said to St. Theresa: No one loses Me, unless he certainly know it. To presume, however, that there has not been a full consensus in a pious man, especially profits these following conjectures, which Croix I i n 547 reports: namely, if such a serious mind and often repeated purpose never to commit mortal sin has had, and does not know for certain that he has revoked it; if upon noticing evil, he is terrified and immediately repels the temptation, but at once doubts whether he consented; if he remembers having proceeded timidly; if he does not know whether in wakefulness or sleep he did something or thought about something, because had he been

vigilant, then already that would be to the point and he would know. Contraeam autem est censendum de eo, qui est assuetus facile in peccata mortalia labi, quia in dubio presumitur iste consentisse: si enim obstitisset, utique recordaretur conatus illius quem sibi intulisset ad tentationem repellendam. Wherefore rightly concludes Croix I. 6 p. 2 n. 612 that scarcely in such men, whether of the first or second kind, is there given mere negative doubt, for presumption (as they say with Soto) Dubitatur III. an it be held that one ought to confess some mortal sin certainly committed, in doubt, whether that were or not confessed.

Response: Si dubium est negativum, certe tenetur illud confiteri, ut communiter docent i c. 10 n. 71 et c. 8 n. 34. On the contrary, if the doubt is positive, such that he probablistically believes himself to have confessed that sin; then the judgment already exists that it has been confessed, and he is not bound to confess it again, and this they safeguard . 27 4r8 Lib. VI. Draw. IV.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: having been sufficiently fulfilled, it is such that I do not approve this judgment regarding a probable confessed sin, since the obligation of Confession is certain and satisfaction is doubtful. Non autem reprobo id, quod iidem citati Auctores tradunt, nempq quod ille, qui diligens fuit in sua peccata confitendo, si postea dubitat, an aliquod peccatum omiserit, postquam multum elapsum sit tempus a quo illud patravit, non teneatur ad confitendum, cum possit credere eo casu moraliter certa jam illud se confessum fuisse. And he adds, P. C. C. n. 6i i. They also add in ibid. Sa, Stoz, and others, do not consider it scrupulous to admit something unless they can swear that it was mortal sin and that they were never confessed it.

See what is said in book I, note 87, verse 2. What nothing. It is doubted whether, one who has confessed some mortal sin considering it to be a doubt, should later be bound to repeat that, when he comes to recognize it as certain? The first opinion denies it, and this they hold. Conf. 1. 2 c. i § 4 n. 24.

Sporer t. 3 pag. 216 cum Arriag. Pell. and Escob. 1:15 n. 17. . 248 n. 167 cum Bosco, Stoz, Herincx, etc., et hanc patrocinatur Lug. d. 16 n. 78. Reason, because that sin had already been explained as it was in the conscience at the time of Confession, and had also already been directly remitted. The second common opinion (which we follow) affirms this, and they hold it, 5 q. 7 p. 4 n. 15. i c. 10 n. 69. Roncag. o. 2 q. 8.

Concio page. Book I. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 419 337 n.

39. . 2 art. 3. d. 51 cap. 2 in Select. qui vocat oppositam improbabilem; et Lugo 1. cit., quamvis primam sententiam tutatus fuerit, tamen sic concludit: Ceterum, quia in re morali non est facile recedendum a communi sententia, nolo in hoc puncto aliquid definire, sed securiorem partem consulere.

The reason for this judgment is that although the sin was directly remitted, it was not considered as it ought to be in conscience according to the Tridentine decree, nor was the substance of the sin explained, which consists in its known gravity; hence, in order to restore the integrity of Confession, it is necessary to manifest this with certainty and clarity. Neither does this hinder what Sporer opposes, namely, that if someone confessed to having fornicated ten times more or less, and later certainly realized he had sinned eleven times, he would again be bound to confess. For it is answered with Roncag. Diana et aliis, quod dispar currat ratio inter primum et secundum casum; in hoc enim secundo casu non ita notabiliter judicium Confessarii variatur congruent in praemunire, nam hic error numeri morali- tenter non est circa substantiam, quia juxta humanum modum loquendi numero decimo addita illa dictione plus minus moraliter includitur undecimus, et ideò sic habet communis praxis fidelium, qui non putant se esse obligatos ad explicandum modicum numeri, quando illum cum incertitudine, dicendo plus minus, exposuerunt. In praemo casu vero, quando quis confessus est peccatum ut dubium et deinde certum agnoscit, error est circa substantiam, quia in accusatione dubia nullo modo includitur certa, ne humana modo ullamque dubia accusatio delicti tamquam certa accipiatur.

They say with very great probability: Chapter one, number sixty-nine, section fifteen of Bonaventure, and also of Decretals, number one. Valer. communisime, quod si quis confitetur peccatum quod nec ipse nec Confessarius sciebat esse mortale et postea novit esse mortale ex genere suo non teneatur iterum 42o Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. to confess that. Reason, because in this case the penitent has already confessed his sin to the Confessor as it was then in his conscience, and now is, and at present nothing new occurs except that he now knows the matter of that sin to be grave, which he previously did not know. ## ARTICULUS II. ## When shall a confession be deemed fully formal? What constitutes full formality? And who is considered physically incapable of achieving material integrity? I. Quando sufficiet confessione integra formaliter? Qua sit forma integritatis? Et quis physice impotentis ad integrum materiale? Mute. Is he bound to confess this in writing, or through signs?

II. Deaf. III. Ignorant of the idiom, does this have to be confessed through an interpreter? IV.

Moribundus. 480 Whether a moribund person who gives signs of pain to the present priest should be absolved, so that he may not be able to explain any sin. 481 Whether an infirm person deprived of senses should be absolved, who shows through the testimony of those present his desire for absolution? When then should absolution be given absolutely, or conditionally? What if no sign of penitence has been given? What if he has been deprived of the act of sinning? When is formal integrity sufficient on account of the danger of death? Can the Confessor absolve in a time of conflict or shipwreck upon hearing one sin? Who is considered morally incapacitated? And what if a sin cannot be explained without violating the seal? Therefore, by what excuse are they excused from material integrity? Is there an obligation to confess a sin if it cannot be named without informing the accomplice? From which causes is it permissible to disclose the accomplice to the Confessor, who knows him? Bull of Benedict XIV prohibiting the inquiry after the name of the accomplice from the penitent. The Author's Sentencia that this in no case will be a future licit occurrence. Even though this Sacrament requires always some confession, nevertheless it is not always necessary that it be materially whole, so long as it be such a form. Cap. I. Dub.

III. Of the essence of this Sacrament. 421 Literally, or morally speaking, that is to say, when speaking morally here and now it can be done, although later you should, if possible, supply the deficiency, not immediately but when you will again be obliged to confess, or wish to do so.. Moreover, when such a Confession suffices, following rules teach. First. Whenever anyone is physically impotent to confess materially what ought to be confessed integrally, sufficiency is provided by formal integrity, because a divine precept does not oblige one to perform the impossible. Whereby they can be absolved in the subsequent cases.

I. Quandocumque quis ad materialiter integre confitendum physice est impotens, sufficit integritas formalis, quia praeceptum divinum non obligat ad impossibile. Mute, even though it signifies one or the other sin by a nod, unless he can otherwise exhibit to the Confessional what is written, in which case it is more probable that he is held to do so, as commonly taught against Cajetan. Navarr. » and others. "First."

Whenever anyone is physically impotent to materially confess what ought to be confessed, suffices the formal integrity, which does not oblige one to the impossible according to divine precept. Whereby they can be absolved in the subsequent cases. I. Quandocumque quis ad materialiter integre

confitendum physice est impotens, sufficit integritas formalis qui a praeceptum divinum non obligat ad impossibile. Mute, licet unum tantum vel alterum peccatum per nutum significare videatur, nisi tamen scripto Confessario exhibere possit, ad quod tunc eum teneri probabilius est, ut communiter docetur, contra Cajetan. Navarr.

» and others. ». It is asked whether a mute is bound to confess by writing, if he cannot do otherwise? The first opinion denies it, and this is held by c. 7 n. 17. Because, as they say, the manner of such confession is always liable to the risk of disclosure. The second opinion, however, is more probable and more common in acceptance, and this view are held by Lugo d. 5 n. 87.

Croix n. 1194. Bonac. d. 5 s. 2. p. ult. 237 n. 134 cum Hanno, et Ratio, quia qui tenetur ad finem, tenetur etiam ad media non difficilia. That, however, is to be understood (as Bonac. and Mutus rightly advert, that one who is bound by the end is also bound by the means, not less; thus to confess so in time of the paschal precept is fittingly taught in c. 6 n. 4 . c. et c. 7 n. 15. with Cajet., Soto, Sa, etc.). Deaf, who cannot explain all [things]. 5 T. 6 C. 8. III.

Ignatius idiomatic, tempo-422 Lib. Six. Tract. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance.

A transgression of a precept, or necessity for another, even if it is not fully understood, if neither the confessor be skilled in language nor an interpreter be available to be had, or even though an interpreter may be present, yet he is not bound to confess through him, as they teach in c. 7 n. 21 with etc. Unless the sick one is doubtful about contrition, as . 4. Nevertheless, then it is sufficient to say some venial sin, l. n. 23 et . What time concerning the plague, or contagion? See n. 489.) See Cardinal de Lugo, De Verbo Domini, d. 15, n. 63. IV.

» If a moribund person suddenly deprived of the use of language is absolved and given signs of pain, or has already given them before others: provided that he did this in order to receive the Sacrament, it should be presumed valid regardless of his state. In such a case, if (at least in the presence of the sick person) testimony is given by one or more mediators, or mediately mediated witnesses, the Priest can be held not only capable but also probable to presume absolve (at least under condition). This teach Diana. » and Lug. d. 17 num. 84 etc. from many others: likewise Bon. citing the declaration of the Cardinals on his behalf: and Præp. q. 4 d. 5 etc., because thus the necessity of the sick person is consulted, and the

reverence of the Sacrament. I said Sallus because 2 exp. confess. citing Licet enim recentiores quidam, ut conf. l. 2 cap. 10 citing Homobonus, and Molf. likewise Phil. Servius in amico fideli, pag. 1 c. 1. de S. Fausto, etc., hold that it can be absolved under condition, namely, if he has lived nearly and Christianly, because interior contrition can be presumed elicited, which the twenty-first judgment of the twelve will judge in Cap. I.

Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 425 • probable: yet it is reasonably rejected by others, as Card. de Lugo d. 17 » s. 3., because there is no external confession at all, • which being a necessary part of this Sacrament, • can be rationally supposed to be absent, assuming that. See Cardinal de Lugo loc. cit., Question 10, Article 18, where he notes: "the absolution which is customarily bestowed upon those inscribed in the Rosary Society, when they are ill, without any confession, is not given as a Sacrament, nor in order to complete the Sacrament, but for indulgence, and for obtaining remission of punishment." » Concerning the absolution to be administered to one on his deathbed, several things are to be noted: and it is certain that he who gives signs of penance to the present priest shall certainly be absolved.

It is expedient that he be absolved so many times as he himself supplies new signs of sorrow: Tambur. in Meth. Confess. L. 2 C. 10 §. 1 n. 7. And inserted in Work. The Cross l. 1, q. 31 with. Sotos, Canos, et Ledesmas objectitant et dicunt: Si defectuatur materia, unde cadit absolution?

It does not indeed (as they say) fall directly upon the sins of the weak, lest afterwards he be held bound to confess them; nor indirectly, since no sin is explained and a direct absolution is given: for by such acts the weak man already acknowledges himself to be a sinner: but indirectly with regard to particular sins, and therefore the penitent is held later to explain those in particular. It is false to say that absolution would then be given as a cause of ignorance; rather it should be said that it is given as a cause known, in a better way than possible, although not fully known, as Croix says, loc. cit. And this is certain according to the manner of speaking. Lib. 424. VI. Draw. IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. 48. Doubt. 1. Whether it can be imparted to a dying and destitute elderly person who shows through the testimony of those present the desire for absolution by giving a sign of sorrow, or by asking for absolution? Canus, Ledesma, et Alvarez equally deny this, 3. R. 4.

But altogether opposing this by affirming with the common sentiment

which they hold, 25 sect. 1 §. concerning him who prays for a confession, 3 c. 8 n. 2. Lugo d. 17 sect. 4 et 5. . 258 n. 201. Moya disp. 6 q. 1. Author cited at Croix, loc. cit., p. 32. Sylv.

Vasq. Scotus holds this presumptively according to Ucione; where he says thus: If...an infirm person who sought anointment had lost knowledge or speech before the Priest came to him, the Priest should anoint him; it is presumed that in such a case he should be baptized and absolved of sins. The same is held by St. Anthony, whose words are referred to in the Roman Sacerdotal (at Lugo, no. 17, num. 36), where it is said: If an infirm person, even though wicked and obstinate, persevering long in sins and not having been confessed for a long time, has asked for a priest that he may confess himself, and meanwhile the priest makes a general Confession on his behalf, the priest should give absolution from all sins. It is proven from the Council of Arausica in c. Qui recedunt. 26 q. 6 where it stands thus: Suddenly becoming mute...a penitent may receive it, if he has the testimony of will or previous consent by words of others, or present consent in his own disposition. Item ex Concil, Carthag.

III. Can. 34 ubi: Si aggrotantes per se respondere non possunt, cum voluntatis eorum testium monitione, hi qui sui sunt, periculo proprio dixerint, baptizentur. Similarly, it must be done regarding penitents. Again Council. Carthag.

IV. Can. 76 thus decreed: He who seeks penance in weakness, if by chance while the Priest invited to come to him he was overcome by weakness and fell silent, or was carried away by frenzy, let those give testimony who heard him, and receive penance. And if it is believed that he will die immediately, he is reconciled through imposition of hands, and the Eucharist may be given to him at his mouth. Chap. I. Doubt. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 425 It is demonstrated by Pope Leo III in the chapter Is qui, causa 26, question 6, and in his letter 89 where he decreed: If the agritutdine have been so aggravated that, as they requested a little before, they should not be able to signify in the presence of the Priest, it will profit them the testimonies of the faithful and those present, so that at once they may obtain the benefits of penance and reconciliation. It is proven the presumption from the Roman Ritual concerning the order of administering, where it states: If between what is to be confessed or presumed before beginning to confess, speech and voice fail; then by nods and signs, as far as possible, the sins of the penitent are sought to be known, whether both generally or specifically recognized, or if a presumed desire to confess sins, either in itself or through others, has been shown, he must be absolved. Adversaries, however, perniciously oppose, that this

Roman Ritual was composed by some private Doctor, although approved by a Pontiff; hence they say, it does not exceed private authority, since it has no authority but only pontifical approval. Verum rectè eos confuunt Lugo d. 17 n. 48 et .c., nam Paulus V. in Bulla exprimit hoc Rituale auctoritate Sedis Apostolice prodisse, his verbis: Postquam Pius Papa V. He thought that the Breviary and Missal should be published; it remained, that the Apostolic Ritual of the Catholic Church of the Sacred Apostolic See (note) should issue by its authority.

Wherefore we exhort in the Lord the Bishops, Parochial Priests, etc., that in future they may make use of the Ritual established by the authority of the Roman Church in the sacred functions, and that in a matter of such moment, which the Catholic Church has approved through its ancient usage, they observe it inviolately. And in our said sentence, Croix n. 1159 has a probable place with Lugo, Diocesan Office, etc., even if there is but one witness and a mediated one testifying to signs given by the lowest; for such testimony suffices to sensibly note the Confession of the sick in the Confessional. Neither does it hinder the Decree of Clement VIII, by which he allowed a confession to be made absent via letter or messenger; for, as Coninch. 1. de Abs. relates, it is sufficient. Moribundus ex testimonio Petri Lombardi et Cardinalis. Bellarmini, Lib. 426.

VI. Traet. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. When later Clement was asked about the aforementioned case of a dying person, he responded that he had very much wanted to understand it, but rather considered such a dying person absolutely to be forgiven. The same [person] testifies Suarez according to Tanner q. 9 n. 16 from the mouth of Clement VIII and Paul V themselves.

The same [person] says. 207. Whether, however, absolution should then be given absolutely or conditionally? Commonly the D.D.'s hold that it should be absolved absolutely, because then (as he says. The Confessor 1:2 c. 10 n. 8 states: The priest operates rightly according to a probable assent; thus Lugo presumes d. 17 n. 90, etc., and the same holds true. However, conditionally, where there is merely prudent doubt. But Croix, although he has asserted the same in 1.6 p.2 n.1769, namely that absolution should be given absolutely when there is a probability regarding the matter; yet in this present case no. 1156 of d.1 he says that absolution should be given conditionally; and the same opinion is held by Wig. tr. 13 n.93.5 sect.2 p.2 §4 n.8 et 23 sect.1 n.12 with Antonin., as he himself asserts.

And this: it seems safer, especially when prudently there is doubt about the given signs, as one might easily doubt in the case, particularly if the sick person be a rustic. Dubitat. 2. 482. What if no witness is present for

the sign of penance given by Quid, if no witness is present for the sign of penance given by the sick man, and the sick man, deprived of his senses, does not give any such sign? Can he be absolved in this case? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by the Bus., as stated above. Lugo d. 17 sect. 3. . 23 sect. 1. Petri totius libri primi quaestio decima sexta.

Abelli p. 139 n. 2. 3. R. 8 but according to the more common opinion of the Second Sentences, I am able and obligated to absolve him, provided that the infirm Christian has lived virtuously, and this is held by Morinus 1. 10 c. 10. Born t. 4 p. 296 q. 5. Holz Cap. I. Dub.

III. On the essence of this Sacrament. Page 151, number 594, p. 427. Sporer n. 245. . 208. . c. Croix n. 1162 cum n. 15 cum Salmer. Juvenin, Pontio, Vanroy, Ign. Machine.

The same is taught by D. Antoninus, whose words are quoted in the citation. In the Roman dotal (according to Lugo, dated 17, no. 36), where it is said: The sick person who has lost either intellect or the use of reason, if he lived well, even though he did not seek the Sacraments because such things happened unexpectedly... should be presumed contrite; and the Priest shall make absolution from every penalty. This is clearly confirmed by D. Augustinus in libello primo de Adulteriis conjugii caput 26, ubi habetur: Catechumenis constitutis in hujus vitae ultimo, si morbo auctasu aliquo sic oppressi sunt ut petere Baptismum non possint, prosit eis quod eorum in fide christiana nota voluntas est ut eo modo baptizentur quo baptizantur infantes, quorum voluntas nulla potuit. Even though his will is uncertain, it is much more advisable to give unwillingly than to refuse willingly where it appears whether he wishes or does not wish [to be baptized] is not evident. Then proceeds the Sacred Doctor in the same book, chapter 28, and teaches that the same reason is to be held for Baptism and Penitence, saying: "Just as there is the same cause of reconciliation with Baptism, so too if penitents have been prevented from ending the danger of their lives; the Mother Church ought not to wish to depart from this life without some hope of its peace."

But you say: where this matter of the Sacrament is found (namely, Confession and contrition), which should be sensible? Gentius respondent et Juvenin, quod si in peccatore moribundo signum simplex doloris datus efficiet ut ipse praesumat se dispositum, quantum magis hoc efficiet bona vita anteacta? But this response does not suffice; for in order to merit the imparting of absolution, it is not enough to suppose an internal disposition of sorrow, but there is required an external manifestation of sins, which lacking, the matter of the Sacrament lacks. Neither does another response of Juvenin satisfy, namely that the act of penitence, according to Scotus

and others, is not material out of which the Sacrament of Penance consists, but only material around which it is, that is, disposition to receive the Sacrament. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. However, the disposition ought not necessarily to be sensible; for this is obstructed by the fact that this Sacrament was instituted by Christ the Lord (as taught by Trent) in a manner of judgment, whence it absolutely requires at least a generic accusation of sins so that the sentence of absolution may be pronounced. Therefore better is the response of ll. cc. with Aversa, Molf. and others, that in such a case there exists a prudent doubt, namely when the dying person either before destitution knew the danger of his damnation, or after destitution advertises it at some lucid interval, wherein it is presumed he wishes and seeks absolution by signs truly sensible, namely by sighs, bodily movements, at least by anxious respiration, although then these signs may not be perceived by the Confessor: such signs are sufficient in so great necessity, even from a prudent doubt presumed; whatever Genettus says, it should be absolutely given as absolved; since no certain sign is present, they well advert to this according to Petrocorens. And : at least on account of reason, because in cases of extreme or urgent necessity it is permissible to use doubtful matter, which is most approved by the Theologians from the beginning, as Juvenin says in his Institutiones. Theol tom. 7 pag. 554 et 557.

In hoc casu poterimus uti opinione tenuis probabilitatis, ut rectè ajunt 2 de Matrim. d. 36 n. 8 et Dec. I. 1 c. 9 n. 25. § 11 vers. Reason, and Croix number 1162 with Soto, and Filguera. Reason, because necessity makes it that the Sacrament can lawfully be administered under a condition in any doubt; for by the condition injury to the Sacrament is sufficiently remedied, and at the same time sufficient care is taken for the salvation of the neighbor. And especially one should note here that the priest, when in Chapter I.

Give. 'THIRD.' On the essence of this Sacrament. 429 it is possible, it is held to absolve gravely an invalid, as Mazzolta states in t. 3 p. 364 et c. As it is collected from c. If a presbyter where it says: If a presbyter denies penance to the moribund, he will be guilty of antimurium. However, he rightly notes this with a proper proportionate distance, because then the necessity ceases which was present in previous acts of absolution. Afterwards, however, it must be said, if the deprivation persists for a long time.

Doubt. 3. Whether he who has been deprived of his senses in the act of sinning, for example, in adultery or duel, can be absolved? Genetius denies

it, p. 300, qu. 6. Habert to. 6 p. 468 Juven. to. 7 p. 555 et Sed affirmant v. But, the Author on Duty.

Confess. (apud Croix) 1. 1 q. 34 et putat probabilem . 261 n. 211. cum Pontio, Carden. Gormaz, et Stoz. They say that such an presumptively sick person should be absolved under the condition, provided it is confirmed that he had been Catholic. They hold this opinion: Merb., to. 2, page 238, verse. Summa et Dupasq. to. 8 p. 225 affirm that any priest can use it, at least under appropriate conditions; and Merbesius confirms this with the authority of D. Augustine in loco de Adulteriis conjugii c. 28, who says: "I do not merely say this about catechumens, but also concerning those themselves who are joined by conjugal bonds to the living, if they have remained in adulterous relationships and within themselves penitent, and unable to respond for themselves, I consider them baptized."

Quis enim novit, utrum fortasse adulterino carnis illecebris usque ad Baptismum statuerant retineri? The same is the cause of Baptism and Reconciliation, if perchance a penitent has been prevented from ending her life by the impediment of sin. Petrocerensis objicit, Sanctum Doctorem hinc loqui tantum de eo qui signum dederit poenientiae, quod ex illis verbis infert, si intra se poenitentes jacuerint; unde (dicit) supponitur, quod tales poenitentes jam aliquod sui poenientiae signum dedierint; alias quomodo possent nosci intra se poenitentes. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. what? Merbesius correctly responds that that which pertains to penitents entering in, should not be understood absolutely, but rather with doubt, namely, if perhaps the penitents have fallen: and this is made manifest by the subsequent words of the Holy Doctor: For who knows whether perhaps they were detained until Baptism from the allurements of adulterine flesh? When therefore St. Augustine said, "Who knows?" he supposes that such sinners have given no sign of any conversion, otherwise it would already be known that they themselves had not determined to detain their adulterous partnerships. Et haec sententia mihi est satis probabilis ob eamdem rationem, quam adductam est in praecedenti Dubio; quia si licite potest et debet absolvi aegrotus sensibus destitutus, qui nullum dederit pœnitentiae signum, si christianè vixerit, eo quod de ipsa prudenter præsumi possit, quod in extremo vitæ, si aliquod lucidum intervallum habet, velit absolutionem sacramentalem recipere; sic praesumptum potest et debet absolvi (intellige semper sub conditione) homo catholicus, etiamsi in actuali peccato sensibus destituatur; pro hoc enim praesumptum merito præsumi potest, quod ipse in proximo periculo suæ damnationis constitutus cupiat omni modo suæ æternæ saluti consulere.

I said a Catholic man; for otherwise it should be spoken concerning a heretic, as rightly he observes: For heretics, even if they give signs of penance in that case, ought not to be absolved unless they expressly ask for absolution, because such signs can never be presumed to suffice in the order of Confession, from which they utterly abhor. « Secunda. When either to the penitent or to the confessor there is imminent danger of death, which neither allows him to confess integrally nor permits hearing that confession, suffices formal integrity. The reason is because then the material sin is not morally possible, which amounts to saying that the case follows accordingly. When either the penitent or the confessor is in danger of death, which neither allows to be confessed completely nor permits to hear, suffices formal integrity. If a penitent, for instance, an infirm one, should lack either in one or another sin mentioned, or there be a grave danger that he should lack, so as not to lack it.

» 2. If a sick person willing to confess is brought the Viaticum while many Confessions are discovered or apprehended, it is found in Chapter I. Dub. III. On the essence of this sacrament. 431: invalid discharges, and the severity of the illness should not endure a delay in absolution.

"(See what is stated at no. 260.)" If the priest himself, being constituted in danger, should appear before one who is about to die, then the penitent should be absolved. » 4. If at a time of pestilence, by prudent judgment, a morally certain danger is present, so that the Confessor may not be endangered, yet if he wishes to hear the whole thing, he shall be held bound for one who repents. » Similarly teaches Concina p. 33g n. 2.

Wigandt tr. 485 13 n. 102. Abelly p. 13g 5 q. 5 sect. 2 punct. 2 n. 13. When then the Confessor, upon hearing some sin, may immediately absolve it. Thus, presumptuously probable is excused to him R. 2. a Confessione materialiter integra, if this be very prolix, with much note of penitent's contrition, while necessity presses for communicating or celebrating, and there does not suffice time. Moreover, even the slightest thing ought to be excused which, on account of the prolixity of the Confession, others might easily suspect him to be greatly burdened with many sins. « 5. If a conflict looms, or if there is a multitude of 486 dying persons, for instance in shipwreck, and they cannot all be heard.

In quo casu possent praesumpti omnes simul, dicto uno peccato, quod minus infamat (vel praesumpti secundum quosdam, si aliter fieri non possit, dicendo in genere se esse peccatores) absolvi, dicendo: Ego vos absolvo, etc. Vide Sa v. Absolution, and Conin. de sacr. d. 7 dub. g. (Non erit autem impotentia sufficiens, si multus fuerit ad eundem Confessarium concursus, ut volebut prop. prop. 36. inter damnatas ob Innocentio XI.)

Tertia. When from the confession of a certain sin, or on account of the circumstances, there is feared a just grave damage either to oneself primarily or to another, whether corporal or spiritual, it can be kept silent. The reason is because the divine precept concerning integrity does not obligate to such an extent of inconvenience that it would merely be possible to sin by confessing, for example. J.

If the priest is about to reveal a certain sin (understand with the congregation). » II. If he knows it, for instance a woman from a certain sin to be in danger of ruin either for herself or the Confessional. III. If to the penitent a serious damage or danger to life or reputation is imminent.

In his "tamen casibus videtur requiri necessitas confitendi," v.g., ob Communionem annuam, vel si longo tempore alioqui esset differenda * (Dicunt Lugo, de) * Vide Card. de Lugo 1. c. Ubi monet, talia damna, aut pericula non facile fingenda esse; et quidem in Religioso vix posse locum habere. » Fourth. If anyone cannot confess some sin or circumstance without violating the seal, for example, if you have invalidly absolved a simoniac, you cannot confess it except to someone who could easily judge and accuse that person; but who that person would be, [this is unclear]. From all that has been said above follows, that presumptuous excusations following from integrity of material wholeness are excusable; I. Whoever have a reserved case, of which see below and 5 t. 6 c. 12. * (But concerning this see note n. 265. v.

What. II.) * » II. Scrupulous, qui perpetuo angitur de oblitis. » * (ita et idem cum comm. et . 150. cum . et Stoic.) * III. Whom the priest absolves before the end, unwilling to hear all, as is related in Quem fallit memoria, so that he may say that he knows generally that he has sinned mortally, but not to encounter the appearance of sin: although at that time some venial sin. The decree has been revoked.

Thus Conin. and so against Sot. and Medina. V. He who is extremely rude or simple-minded and says that he suffers from sins, yet in no species, neither venial nor even, knows how to say: although, speaking speculatively, one could possibly do so according to Cap. I. Doubt.

III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 435 "absolve," yet practically it is not expedient, but with benediction let him be permitted to communicate. Thus. » c. VI. Whoever cannot confess some sin without implicating defamation, for example, if he had sinned with his mother or sister whom the Confessor knew, then indeed, if one could not have another Confessor to go to instead, whom one was bound to approach otherwise, it would

suffice, nay should be said, that in his mind with her, or generally speaking with some fornication or incest, he had kept silent, thereby refraining from the first or second degree as far as permissible without disclosure of the accomplice, with the intention of completely confiding in another Priest at a later opportunity.

Ita probabiliter 6, Gomaz etc. Ratio est, quia quando duo præcepta divina concurrunt, naturale et positivum, quæ simul servari non possunt, præferendum est naturale,quia strictius obligat. Even though it is more probable that the contrary be taught. » » de Lugo » extends also to non-complicating, without whose manifestation sin cannot be explained; therefore it is to be attended to in the confessional; lest names be mentioned of persons, unless for the purpose of directing the penitent would it be necessary; then this infamy is not esteemed so greatly, and he who sins will impute it to himself. Nevertheless, it must be weighed whether the benefit of direction outweighs the infamy. The reason for the aforementioned is that in these cases morally speaking it is not possible to make a materially integral confession.

See Dian p. 3 t. 4. Case 64 and 131 and page 1, section 7. Res.49 Les. 1.2 c. 11 d. 11 1. 2 c. 9 § 2, ubi docet, probabile esse, quod talis pœnitens propter solam consolationem; quam sentit ab amico vel docto Confessario, possit ei confiteri, etsi alium habere possit. » Whether there is an obligation to confess a mortal sin which cannot be explained except through the complexities of its disclosure? Tom, V. 28 434 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. The first proposition denies this, and besides what was said above, Diana holds it in her treatise on book 7, chapter 49, with Soto and Piget.

Reason, because (as they say) the natural precept of preserving the reputation of one's neighbor must be preferred to the positive precept of preserving the integrity of confession; and they consider this probable both according to Bonaventure 10 q. 4 and according to St. Bonaventure. S. Lugo, Consentio. Pontius, et aliis plurimis, ex hoc: Si speciem peccati poeniteius exprimere non possit, nisi exprimendo personam cum qua peccavit, puta si cum sorore concubuit, necesse est ut exprimendo peccuti speciem exprimat personam. But if it is possible, he should seek out such a Confessor who does not know the identity of the sister. And the same is taught by St. Bernard in the Form.

Honorable life, saying: Of no one should you speak ill, except in confession, where it cannot be otherwise manifested your sin. The reason

is because the precept of confessing integrally must always be kept; and it can lawfully be kept in a manner that is sufficiently lawful for our case, since the manifestation of another's crime is not illicit. This follows from a reasonable cause; as it is taught by the same authority, 2a 63 q 2 a 2. Therefore, it must be kept; and thus the response is given to the first opposed proposition. Beyond which, he who by consenting in sin has already lost his right concerning his reputation with regard to the confession of that sin: We have said it is a mortal sin; for on account of a venial sin or another mortal sin confessed, it is not permissible to manifest a grave crime of another person. As rightly say Lugo, d. 16 n. 412 and 413. 5 ar. 7 n. 5. 2 c. 9 § 2 n. 15. et contra Renzi, et Verric. However, the penitent is bound, when conveniently possible, to seek another Confessor, concerning whom the identity of the accomplice is unknown, so that the reputation of the latter may be preserved; nor is this sufficiently probable - Cap. I. Dub.: II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. It seems to those who hold the opinion of Tourn. Preface 207 v. I said, Renzi cap. 2 sect. 2 qu. 10 with Fag., who cites Suarez (but not well, as we shall see shortly), also 16 num. 3q2 namely that this is only a matter of counsel; for commonly they say this to be a matter of precept. Sect. 2 n. 1 where: If penance can be imposed on one who does not know the identity of the accomplice, he is bound to do so: and in this all agree. n. 59. 3 R: 2. . 5 art. 7 n. 5, who holds it to be certain, as Lugo loc. cit. with Vasq. et Con. I have said that when it is convenient to do so, for according to the opinion of many, 490 rum [is] the judgment which excuses a penitent who follows another confessor sought out, namely, I.

If there were a danger of death, or a commandment concerning the confession or communion, then: Sporer p. 226 n:472 et . art. 5. II. If the penitent should incur a stain of infamy by not celebrating or communing, thus: Sporer p. 243 n:13 sect 2. Lugo, d. 16, n. 416. c. III. If anyone were to exist in a mortal sin and should be obliged to wait beyond two days, as is stated in chapter 8, and C. et Renzi, with whom Antoine c. 2 q. 13 R. 3 agrees where he says; absolutely not to be held bound to await, who is in the state of guilt, Lugo n. 416 thinks that such a one would be less obligated to defer his Confession, although later he subordinates: He will not act improperly if he defers Confession for two days.

And Herincx, and others at n. 123, criticize excessive delay for two or three days. IV. If it is believed that the complex has ceased from its own law of reputation, for example, if a brother has sinned with his sister, which he knows he cannot follow due to the company of his mother, so as to go and confess another Confessor; If someone was accustomed to

celebrating or communing gravely, and it would be grievous to omit celebration, or Communion, Lugo d. 16 n. 416. VI. If anyone finds it difficult to confide another, than as is customary, conscience to a Confessor, chapter 436 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. The Sacrament of Penance. It is useful. VII. If he were deprived of the privilege of Jubilee or the benefit of indulgence; Renzi 1. c. with Cotonio, and a. 416.

VIII. Frequently excuse mothers and wives, who manifest the sins of their sons and husbands in the Confessional, those who know these; for they commonly do this either to seek counsel or to alleviate sorrow; otherwise it would be excessively harsh for novices to approach new confessors; Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1145. IX. If anyone, because of the consolation which he feels from a friend or from a learned Confessor, should not wish to seek another, although there are many DD ut 3 n. 973 v. But they say that it is not more than to manifest a venial crime to one or another virtuous man; wherefore he says .

This Bull N. SS., however, should be diligently observed. P. Bened. XIV. beginning, Where first you will find it at the end of this Moral Theology. Dec. IV. ubi Pontifex rigorosè prohibet, ne confessarii exquirant à pœnitentibus nomen complicis peccati.

Therein he especially detests that practice of theirs, who from penitents... (words of the Bull) sought to pass around the name of accomplice sin at every opportunity, and not merely to induce them by persuasion to reveal it, but what is more detestable, also denied them sacramental absolution altogether and compelled them to reveal it. Then the Pontiff imposes the following penalties upon those who contravene, saying: Moreover, we decree..., so that whoever shall dare to teach such a practice as is hereinafter condemned in our said Brief, or to write or speak in defense thereof, or to impugn what has been decreed against it in the same Brief, or to pervert or misinterpret the same in reckless fashion, falls ipso facto into excommunication from which he cannot be absolved except by us. Speaking however about confessors inquiring after the name of the complicitor to that penitent, if he shall refuse to manifest it, by denying the sacramental absolution; he says: They have become aware of themselves, beyond the deadly sin Capital I. Dub. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 437 incursion, suspension from Office due to hearing Confessions, and other things are presumed to be subject to graver penalties. And below adds the Pontiff, that whoever, outside of

Confession, should learn that someone is inquiring about the name of a confessor from another source, is bound to deny him absolution within the usual term, subject to customary penalties. He nevertheless excuses the case in which the Confessor, out of simplicity, would do this, saying: Although imprudent and evil, some simple act of his was nonetheless naked and bare, that is to say, destitute of those circumstances which the Brevi reproves as praiseworthy, rather than as licit, such as a wrong credulity or a bad adherence to practice... thereby making the same Confessor suspect. However correctly it is said by P. 21 and the Author besides, in book Praeterea, chapter 492, note 1 from Lugo, Soto, Armilla, Diana, Aversa, etc., speaking about the aforementioned Bull, he says thus: "(If serious damages were feared from a complicit person, which only the Confessor could prevent, it would be manifest to him)." The cited Author in Comment. in Antoine I. c. says this: " (It can sometimes happen that the penitent must be urged to reveal the accomplice, especially when dealing with grave evils threatening to turn into harm for the Republic: 458 Lib." VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance: they can. That a malum may be prevented, if possible, the penitent is obliged to seek counsel from the Confessor, who by his own prudence or through the penitent himself shall find remedies; and unless the penitent wishes to reveal, he ought not minimally to be absolved; for according to both justice and charity, he is bound to take care with firmness that public safety may be in security. Regarding the avoidance of harm, when it is possible that some private individual may be endangered, I do not speak, for the priest can usually provide counsel with names of accomplices suppressed); so says the aforementioned authors.

Here however what I think about this, it is permitted to explain to you. There is no doubt that at times a penitent may be required to disclose his accomplice in order to prevent some grave harm; but this is expressed in the Bull with an eye to avoiding the rigor (as we have seen) of the Pontifical prohibition for the sake of preventing proximate infamy, sacrilege, seal violation, scandal, etc.; therefore, it is not licit to inquire about the name of the accomplice in the confessional for the purpose of effecting correction. Wherefore, in the case where the penitent is truly bound to reveal the accomplice, he can do so only to that extent. The confessor is not permitted in general to impose on the penitent that he reveal a complicit witness to someone who can prevent scandal, but it will never be licit for the confessor to say: Reveal to me. Si vero pœnitens ex se et sponte suâ rogaret Confessarium ut complicem corriget, tunc Confessario multa prudentia opus est; nam ordinariè loquendo non expedit ut se immittat in hujusmodi rem; ipsi enim tantum incumbit curare

damnum sui pœnitentis, non alienum, et solummodo intrà confessionem, non extrà; et ex alia parte Confessarius difficulter assumet hoc munus corrigendi sine periculo scandalì et offensionis sacri ministerii.

Chapter I. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. It should be secret. It should be true. When shall a lie in confession be venial?

When mortal? « Resp. Besides integrity there are these three: The first, as it is said, "that one should not sin in this, because, that speech may be vocal, it suffices that it be externally expressed," namely ordinarily, and for this reason useful to the Church's practice, unless there be a just cause, such as physical or moral weakness, which if present can be overcome by gesture, writing, or some other sign: e.g., if someone cannot speak due to anxiety, or a girl beyond modesty cannot otherwise express herself except in writing, which is read by the confessor, she may add vocally, "I accuse myself of this." From de Lugo, 5 t. 6 c. 6 n. 3. » (And even when among all, concerning the Privilege where it is said: Unless the necessity of a peg intervene, the confession of the mouth must be sanctified. The same authors also say regarding him who, on account of a grave impediment of speech, experiences great difficulty in confessing vocally. The same applies.

But he who otherwise cannot is bound according to common opinion to confess by a nod or in writing at the time of the precept; even though this does not depart from regard for Scripture. n. 479.) * See C. de Lugo d. 15 n. 87. Similarly they counsel to write a confession for the deaf, so that it may be heard by others (although they are not bound to do this), and on account of the same reason, they declare those not to be questioned except about plainly necessary matters, from ## Where this is resolved. He who makes the Confession entirely outside of necessity by word or writing mortalistically sins, and consequently is not absolved. 127 ex 440 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Sylvio. See Filius to. 1 tractatus 7 caput 1. Concilium de decimo quinto dubio primo.

Section twenty-one, paragraph three, note five. The second condition, that it be secret, namely, that it be done only to the Sole Priest, not indeed out of necessity, but for the use of the Church. However, public, as in a shipwreck, before the pilot, in the hospital, where others are adjacent, or through an interpreter is made, does not obligate (at least with respect to hidden sins), unless out of charity he himself doubts about contrition; and even then it suffices to confess what produces lesser infamy. Thus. 29 etc.

Hence it is resolved. If anyone should have forgotten his sins confessed in previous Confessions, he is not bound to presume and confess them publicly or through an interpreter in the article of death; because confession of forgotten sins obligates only by divine positive precept, which in this case ceases.

V. The third condition, that it be true: which is required essentially in the substantial matter, and necessary; because otherwise the judge would be deceived in a serious matter, and the confession would not be complete, and consequently irksome. Non tamen in materia libera, tum quia falsitas signi in accusatione circa materiam accessoriam non facit sententiam irritam: tum quia talis tantum peccat venialiter, cum non sit graviter injurius Sacramenti, nec Sacrandoti. Thus Navarr. . Herein the resolution. » 1. It is neither mortal nor irritates the Sacrament I.

If in confession one lies about matters lightly related to things not entirely pertinent or necessary to the Sacrament: v. » gr. si narrares falsam historiam, vel si neges veniale, vel mortale, quod non tenes confiteri. Would one gravely sin who denies in confession having committed some venial sin, or a mortal sin otherwise confessed? Cap. I. Doubt. II.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 441 sum? Cajet affirmant in 2. 2. D. Thomas q. 69 art. 1. Ring according to Renzi, c. 2, sect. 2, q. 3. Because (as they say), this seems to confer a grave irreverence upon the Sacrament; and on this point P. Th. 1, c., who says: If one refuses to confess the truth which one is bound to declare, or if one falsely denies it, he mortally sins.

Whereby P. Concina does not excuse from mortal sin one who would advertently do this, because he exposes himself to the danger of a grave culpable risk. But it must be entirely held to be opposed to the common opinion, which Busemb. holds as stated above, and Lugo teaches in d. 16. n. 98. Antoine p. 511 qu. 13. 5. Response 1. Renzi 1. c. et . et aliis passim: ratio, quia, cum illa non sit materia necessaria Sacramenti, tunc minimè decipitur Confessarius in re gravi.

As for the text of St. Thomas, the response is clear; there he, the Holy Doctor, speaks only of unwillingly admitting the truth in a civil judgment when one is bound to speak it: but in the sacramental forum it is certain from Trent that there is no obligation to confess venial sins; hence, with regard to a venial sin committed and already confessed as mortal, it does not exceed the malice of simple lying. • II. If falsely you accuse another of a venial sin; yet if you do this by withholding other matter, since thereby you render an improper form and the Sacrament invalid: unless you do so

from scruple or perturbation. Italy Suarez, 7 c. 4. 4 t. 6 c. 8. Res. 96. » 2.

Sacrilege is, and there is no absolution. 1. If you deny or affirm what you are bound to confess and believe to be such, lest it be understood otherwise. That it may commonly be taught in opposition to "if you deny, or lie concerning another ritual absolution for sins," when the Confessor, as judge or physician regarding such matters, asks something necessary for present confession. Card. de Lugo d. 14 sect. 10. If to the present Confession he does not make inquiry, according to the aforementioned.

442 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance.

If anyone affirms a mortal sin that he did not commit, or denies having committed a sin that he did indeed commit, he commits two mortal sins: one of sacrilege against the virtue of religion by denying the due reverence for the sacrament, and another of grievous lying against the virtue of veracity; thus rightly ## ARTICLE IV. ##. When will confession be invalid, and how should it be repeated? Does a confession made by an excommunicated confessor count with the penitent? With a deaf, illiterate person, etc.? With one who is not hearing some sin? On forming judgment of sins from the confessional. When will a confession be invalid in part due to the penitent? How should a confession previously made to the same confessor be repeated? And what if the confessor remembers only confusedly? Dub. 1. What if the confession has been rendered invalid? Dub. 2. What, if only the penance imposed is remembered?

Dub. 3. What if one has confessed merely that which is penitential? 504 What about the rustic folk who have never explained the species nor the number? There is no obligation to repeat the Confessions unless it be established from their nullity. 498» Resp. i. This happens from two aspects. Firstly, from the standpoint of the Confessor, if he did not have jurisdiction, or certainly was impeded by a censure (always and through itself is to be avoided, whether tolerated or not); or if he vitiated the form substantially, or vitiated the form substantially and did not intend to absolve, or did not understand any sin. Or did not intend to absolve, or did not understand any sin. I say, no sin; because if by reason of deafness, somnolence, or distraction, some, although mortal sins, were not understood without culpable negligence on the part of the penitent, it is more probable that absolution would have been valid and only subsequently repeated upon hearing, contrary to what others teach. Chapter I.

Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. 443 » p. 4 t. 4. Response 198. I

add without guilt: because if you confess with malice or lying faith, you commit a sin, and the Confession is invalid, therefore it must be repeated. 2 c. 10 §. 3.

Finally, some add cum . But that Suarez would have considered it to be venial what was mortal; hence, a confession made in good faith such as this is not deemed to require repetition. Thus Henry. c. 10 n. 69. Reply against Vasquez, number 121. I said with fidelity, because, if out of bad faith, for instance, you sought such a Confessor who could not heal you, you should repeat the confession: since when you confessed in act, having acknowledged your fault, you were not duly prepared, and therefore also not absolved. 2 c. 10 § 3 * (Thus, therefore, the confession must be repeated by one ignorant of the Confessor's ability, when the penitent already knows him to be insufficient; or when he clearly sees that the Confessor cannot perceive the gravity of his sin. 28 sect. 2 n. 12 et Lugo d. 16 n. 602 cum Gabr.

Finally, if by a finite confession you understand that the Confessor has somehow failed to perceive something, whether due to sleep or distraction, and you do not know what those things are, you should have the confession repeated briefly, because he can prudently doubt about each individual thing; but if it has been long, then it is said: "You are not bound by a contrary reason"; and it suffices to confess that which you doubt whether the Confessor has perceived something from your own sins. * (Thus those who hold the presumption maintain that Christ did not impose such a precept with so much burden upon the integrated ones in this case, namely, to repeat all sins; and the same is taught by Lugo on December 16th number 609, together with Salm de Pœnit. canon 9 number 26 with Lugo and 500.) And they also say. and. 727 444 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance, when. Then they say: c. g- n. 26, at the same place teaching: neither a presumed mortal nor venial sin in cases that are obvious. Reason, because although proper penance is not imposed, the absolution is nonetheless valid, since from both sides there now concur what is required for the worthiness of the Sacrament. Thus it must be held that Christ the Lord instituted this Sacrament, since such defects occur frequently. This nevertheless I say, intelligendum, nisi constet numerum vel species explicatas non fuisse; alias integritas Confessionis certo supplenda est, ut recte advertunt cum communi.

Lugo distinguishes [or discusses] 22 n. 77. . 276 n. 254 et idem Secundo. It is invalid from the part of the penitent if he was excommunicated, of which more below: if he has remained silent about a mortal sin; or falsely

accused himself of one; if he has negligently been remiss in examining his conscience: also if he has not been moved (which usually appears when he seeks out a deaf, unlearned, blind confessor, etc. See there): if he does not wish to remove occasions, etc. V. what can be added thereto at most, if a carnal sin was confessed with the complicity of the penitent himself. * (This is certain today from the Bull of Benedict.) XVI. sub poena excommunicationis in absolventem Papa reservato. See Decret. I.

Bened. XIV. at the end of this » Resp. 2. If confession with the same Confessor were repeated, it suffices to accuse oneself by a single word in common of sins previously known to him, provided that one remembers them, even vaguely, or at least their status and condition, according to Cap. I. Doubt. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 4:5 - of man in general, or of penance imposed upon himself, "as Vasq. teaches . 123." But if none of these, but only what has been confessed to him is remembered, he considers it valid, even illicitly, as having absolved. The same absolutely teach that retracting with whom one has confessed, he considers probable that which presumptuously can licitly absolve. It is questioned whether the Confession should be repeated if the Priest has forgotten the sins heard before he improperly grants absolution? It is commonly held among the Doctors that confession made to the same confessor should not be repeated when it was prolix or the absolution was delayed, and the penitent remembers at least in a confused manner the status of the penitent. Thus. 22 sect. 6. at the end, 7 dub. 11 n. 100 Bonac. qu. 5 sect. 2 p. 3 n. 15.

Cross n. 1216. cum communis. Doubt 1. is: should the Confession be repeated with the same Confessor when the Confession was invalid? The first probable opinion, which .c.n.7. and Con. l. cited maintain, distinguishes and says that if the Confession was null through no essential defect in any part of the Sacrament, namely because there lacked sorrow or integrity in the penitent, or legality in the Confessional, then the whole must be repeated. Reason, because in that case the confession was not sacramental. And this opinion is partly agreed with by Croix n. 1216, namely in the case where the confession was invalidated due to a lack of jurisdiction in the confessional, because then it was made without judgment.

Otherwise, if the Confession was invalid on the part of the Confessor, solely by reason of his own defective pronouncement of the form, or because he did not have the intention of absolving. And this is common among all (as Croix says in the cited passage), provided that the Confessor remembers the state of the penitent. The second opinion is more common

and no less probable than that held by Lugo on the 16th day [of the month], note 638, chapter 2, note 9. Diana page 3, treatise 4, rubric 123 446 Library. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. To the Sacrament of Penance. cum communi, cum Sa, S. Aversa, et alii ap. Croix d. n. 1216. says, that, whatever defect may have occurred, whether on the part of the Confessor because there was a lack of judicial knowledge, or on the part of the penitent because there was a lack of disposition or integrity, it is not necessary to repeat the confession; but suffices if the Confessor remembers the state of the penitent, or resumes his notion thereof in confusion, and the penitent in common accuses himself of all previously confessed sins. The reason is that although the first confession was not sacramental because it was sacrilegious or made without judgment, yet its ratification is considered sufficient when the penitent subsequently accuses himself generally of the confessed sins, joined with the previous knowledge held by the Confessor.

Item, quia (ut probabiliter censet Croix l. c.) talis Confessio, cum facta fuerit in ordine ad ab- solutionem recipiendam, sufficienter dicitur praesumptum sacramentalis, quatenus ipsa praesumptum ad sigillum sacramentale obstringit. But it is not pleasing the sentiment of Lugonis n. 638, which Aversa follows according to Croix n. 1217, namely, that if the penitent shall have narrated his sins merely to the confessor and afterwards accuse himself in general of those same sins, then it suffices that the confessor remembers them in confusion. But more truly is it said according to Croix loc. cit., then the confession must be entirely repeated. Reason, because then there was no sacramental confession at all, neither the first nor the second; not the first, because the sins were not made manifest in order to obtain absolution, so that the confessor would not be bound by the seal of the sacrament: not the second, because the sins were not confessed individually, as required by Trent, where it is said that in a sacramental confession all and every sin should be explained. Doubt is cast.

What if the Confessor indeed remembers only the state of penance imposed, and not the confused memory of the penitent? They say that this is sufficient for absolution, as stated above with Vasq. Sa, etc. And the reason seems to be, because from itself no Cap. I. Dub. III. On the essence of this Sacrament. The confession of a penitent's state by the confessor can form a judgment regarding the status of the penitent.

It is doubted 3. What if the Confessor has neither remembered the state of the penitent nor the penance imposed, but rather what he himself had imposed as penance? In this case they say: according to Croix n. 1216, it

suffices if he remembers that he himself imposed penance. But to this I do not assent, because the Priest, while pronouncing the sentence, ought at least to form a judgment concerning the state of conscience of the penitent. In the case, however, where the Confessor has neither imposed penance nor retained even a confused notion of the penitent's state, he certainly cannot licitly impart absolution, as rightly stated by Lugo n. 642.

Cross number 1218. And if nevertheless then he should absolve, having made Confession in common, I would validly absolve, as c. with Aversa, Illsung, and Diana. "Resp. 3. Rarely does it hinder. The defect on the part of the Confessor, if the penitent innocently ignores him; because in the subsequent confession he will be absolved from what he presumed to have been absolved by those from whom he thought himself properly absolved. Therefore, this is resolved. He who, having reached puberty, commits some grave sin, for instance. » remissionem, inculpabiliter omisit, ut quia putavit » leve esse vel nullam, non ideò tenetur repetere » alia peccata (vel confessiones intermedias), sed » hoc tantùm, ut docent Bon. 1 c. 16. Sanchius addens: si simplex rusticus, qui tota vita tantum fecit confessiones generales, nihil confitens in specie, nec aliter instructus sit, etsi validè is sit absulutus cum onere, ut cum melius cognoverit, omnia subjiciat clavibus; si tamen veniat, quando ingens est copia poenitentium, ut tunc disponi non possit ad omnia repetenda, posse eum absolvi, audiverunt. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. "tamen nevertheless, sins committed by the penitent since the last confession, " with an obligation, that he may do better. Thus. c. 9 n. 4. where it adds ex c. 5 sect. 4 num. i53. and Joan.

I sanction; although from a culpable error, such a mortal sin, for example, as gluttony or any other necessary circumstantial element omitted, is not therefore to be considered invalid repetitions of confessions duly and legitimately made (in which through natural oblivion you were not confessed that defect), if they are valid and remain valid. The opinion enunciated above, according to Busembach, namely that confession might be diminished in part on account of the multitude of penitents (although the chapter does not hold this absolutely), is prohibited by Innocent. XI. In Prop. 59, quae dicebat: Licet sacramentum absolvere dimidiatè tantùm confessos, ratione magni concursùs poenitentium, qualis v. g. potest contingere in die magnæ alicujus festivitatis aut Indulgentiae. 504 Quod autem ad Confessionem rusticorum pertinet, dici I. . Confess. 1. 3 c. 2 n. 9. cum Hurt. quod rustici et pueri, qui bonâ fide confessi sunt, omittendo explicandas species et numerum suorum peccatorum, non sint cogendi ad Confessiones repetendas; sed hoc omnino est improbabile, quia licet

hujusmodi rustici non teneantur repetere integre confessiones praeteritas, cum illæ satis fuerint validæ ut dicunt communiter et merito et cum . Prepo. Hurt.

Fill. and ibid. n. 25.) because such Confessions already contain all things essentially requisite; for formal Confession is about essence, not material; yet they are required to explain the omitted species and number so that at least the present Confession may be made complete; thus Lugo d. 22 n. 77. et et c. 12 n. 49. with Sylvester and others frequently. It is said by the Second. P. Segneri (Instruct, Confes. c. 1) citans Cap. I. Dub. III.

On the essence of this Sacrament. Perez and Lugon, d. 16, n. 585 (but this not well, as we shall see below) that if a rustic in past Confessions has spoken of his sins in a manner rudimentary and confusedly, the Confessor should not obligate him to repeat Confessions, because those sins have already been directly absolved. But this is also not pleasing, for although those Confessions were valid on account of the integrity of the form, and the sins had been directly absolved, nevertheless they themselves lacked what pertains to material integrity, which must always be supplied. And Lugo in the cited place says, it is more difficult to respond to this difficulty; there he says: one might follow a contrary opinion by means of the sense of those AA., who say that there is no obligation to again explain a sin previously confessed as a doubt if it is later known with certainty. But we have already rejected this opinion with the common number 476. They say III.

This assertion made so broadly has not satisfied; for I hold that it can be admitted only when at the beginning of the Confession the penitent opens to the present Confessor what he has always confessed in the past years, omitting the number thereof, and the Confessor, excluding the Confession of that year from the outset, forms simultaneously a judgment concerning the past years. But otherwise it must be said, if after the exception made for the confession of that year, the confessor observes that the penitent has omitted to explain the number of sins from previous years; then indeed, if from the present confession he has a distinct knowledge of the sins, he can certainly (and without repeating the previous confessions) form a simultaneous distinct judgment about the past years; but if from the present confession he has only a confused knowledge of the confessed faults, as often happens in longer and more involved confessions, in that case . 45o Lib. VI. Draw. IV.

On the Absolution of Penitents. (as well says Lugo d. 16 n. 640.) it is held necessary to take a distinct knowledge of species and the omission of number in past Confessions; and that such knowledge is insufficient for

absolution, when there is a confused state of the penitent regarding the years past, since on one hand the penitent is bound to confess his sins singly, which he has never done; and on the other hand, the confessor is sometimes required to form a distinct judgment about the sins. Moreover, this must be diligently observed: that penitents are not compelled to repeat Confessions unless there is a certain delay in order to establish that they were invalid, as rightly say Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1221. Gobat. tr. 7 n. 275. Resp. Mazzotta tom. 3 p. 362 et 281 n. 273. cum qui inter rigidos Auclores nostri temporis non habet infimum locum. Ratio, quia possessio stat pro valorem Confessionum praeteritarum, quamdiu de earum nullitate non constat. You will say: When there is a precept and there is doubt concerning its fulfillment, the obligation of the precept prevails; therefore, in doubt regarding the value of past confessions, there exists an obligation to repeat them.

But it is replied that the aforementioned rule applies then, when there is a precept and doubt arises as to its fulfillment; namely, whether the act of fulfillment has been placed or not. But if such an act has already been lawfully placed, and subsequently doubt arises as to its validity or invalidity, then it is to be considered valid; for in such a case another principle applies, namely that in doubt the act is to be held valid, as commonly taught by DD. 1 c. 5 n. 32, according to the Glossa on 1. In contraffictu, D. de reg. Law. Cross 1. 1 n, 91. Sporer trans. 1 cap. 7 num. 78.

Mazzotta t. 1 n. 74, qui asserit communem, et Sporer tr. 1 c. 7 n. 78, ubi dicit: Praesumptio pro actus valore praeponderat aliis. And as for the obligation of repeating Confessions of recidivists, whose value is often doubted, this rule is excellently represented by Habert in t. 6 p. 465, thus saying: « (If a penitent has produced worthy fruits of penance for some time after Confession, namely strenuously, according to Chapter I. Dub. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. Against temptations and occasions of sin, the Confessor will judge that the Confession was valid.

Thus if he had relapsed even a little while after Confession, or after the first occasion given, then it is truly morally certain that there were no Confessions, for he who truly repents in Confession and proposes amendment; at least abstains from sin for some time; at least makes an effort before the relapse; hence whoever after his Confessions most certainly soon and without any resistance again commited the same, must be considered as having had either no sorrow or a very slight one, or no purpose. Otherwise, however, it must be said, if he has persevered for some time, or at least offered some resistance to a chaste temptation. ## DUBIUM IV. ## DISCONTENT. ## ARTICLE I. ## What is the necessity

and quantity of such? 506 How is satisfaction necessary? And whether its omission is venial in venial sins? Whether its omission is venial in venial sins?? By what cases can a light penance be imposed? And whether it can be diminished on account of that: Whatever good thing you do etc.? When may a lesser penance be lawfully imposed than is just? How many should there be according to Trent? Is it a just reason for diminishing penance if one fears that the penitent will fulfill it? Authorities on this point. Can an entrance into religious life or acceptance of a conjugal status be imposed as penance? At what times can or should public penance ever be imposed? Dubium 1.

Can an obligation otherwise due be imposed in lieu of penance? Dub. 2. Is penance soon previously imposed? Can an interior work be imposed? And whether a work can be done for the dead? Is a cessation from some good work permissible?

Can a penance be imposed after absolution? Under what obligation is the penitent bound to accept and fulfill penance? Lib. 352, Sub 515. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. 516 Doubt 1.

Whether a penitent is bound to accept and fulfill just penance gravely? What if it is graver than just? 517 Dub. 2 What if it has been imposed for venial or mortal sins confessed? 518 Dub. 3. May the penitentiary give a grave penance for grave sins under the obligation of a light command? 519 Dub. 4. May the confessor omit the imposition of penance at a time of Jubilee or plenary indulgence? 520 Dub. 5. Whether, if the penitent has forgotten the penance, he is bound to repeat the Confession that he may receive it? 521 On a penitent who fulfills penance in mortal sin.

What is the delay that makes mortal the fulfillment of penance? 522 Dub. 1 Whether one existing in a mortal state can satisfy penance. 523 Dub. 2. Would it be a sin to satisfy penance in mortality? Could penance be imposed under condition if one relapsed? Does the obligation to perform penance cease after the prescribed time has passed? Can penance be fulfilled through another person? Should penance be performed before Communion? Who and how can penance be commuted? In such a case, is the penitent bound to repeat Confession? Dub. 2, What if penance has been imposed for reserved sins? Dub. 5. May the penitentiary confessors change penance outside of confession? The penitential canons are annotated by the principadores.

Resp. 1. Satisfaction, or Penance given by the Confessor, is necessary not by necessity of the Sacrament, but by precept; hence it should regularly be

imposed by the Confessor according to Suarez, and n. 12 under mortal sin; nevertheless, Cardinal de Lugo allows that on account of the smallness of the matter venial sin can be committed voluntarily, as in d. 25 n. 47, for example, if light penance were to be imposed on account of venial sins; for such omission is only venially forgiven. * (And it is considered probable with 44.) And indeed proportionate both to the sins and to the capacity of the penitent. The reason for this is that it is a part of the Sacrament, not essentialis, but integralis tantùm, having effect ex opere operato, and greater vi Sacramenti than those mentioned in Chapter I. Dub.

IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. 45 without it. The reason for the latter is, moreover, found in qu. 5, § 3, p. 2. Hence it is resolved. 1. The confessor is excused sometimes, if he imposes (even) very slight or no penance at all, for example.

I. Si advertat vehementissime contritam poenitentem, vel aliter satisfactam. Cajet. . 5 qu. 5 sect. 3 p. 2 n. i et 2. Since however this rarely or never can sufficiently stand, it is safer * (Indeed necessary according to ; as rightly admonishes C. de Lugo d. 23 sect. 4 n. 48. II.

If a penitent be mentally impotent, or otherwise incapacitated, or near to death, or very weak, who nevertheless prudently enjoins upon himself some slight act of contrition, such as a light beating of the breast, invocation of JESUS (even slightly from the heart), other pious movements, or that through his heirs he care for sacrifices, almsgiving, and similar pious works, Suarez advises that it can be enjoined; so that he may patiently bear his infirmity, and what can indeed greatly distress the afflicted and fearful one, that he may duly satisfy. *(Note here what is contained in the Roman Ritual: "Not to impose severe... contrition on the sick, but only to indicate that contrition which, if they recover, they will perform at an opportune time." And the same is said in chapter » Ab infirmis. 26 qu. 8. They say moreover and the Dicastery, Decree 14, Doubt 2, n. 14: that if a firm person can satisfy through almsgiving, penance should be imposed in the Confessional). III. When scrupulous frequently returns to the same hour with new sins; because it is supposed that sufficient confession has been made in the preceding ones. . 4 c. 1 ex . Even though the Confessor sins out of commonality, if he very severely imposes a small penance for great sins, Diana in part 3, treatise 4, res g2 thinks that he can be excused if he adds: "Whatever good you have done," etc. However, this rule cannot universally be admitted, as the Cardinale de Lugo notes in decree 25 number 57 Con.

And 5, and part 9, t. 9; Resol. 54; and it is rightly rejected by others, because the words, as they are merely supplicatory, do not have the power

to elevate all good works to the efficacy of the sacrament. Turned aside Question 13, Section 7. Whether: by those words: "Whatever good thing you do..." all good works of the penitent shall be raised to the effect of sacramental satisfaction, although they were not imposed? It denies this, Article 6, Note 3, because the power of the keys raises the works of the penitent when they bind; therefore, since those words do not obligate in particular, they do not bind, and consequently, the works cannot be raised. But much more probable and common is the affirmation of St. Thomas in Fulfillment [or "Fill"], Treatise 8, Chapter 2.

Sporer n. 560. with Reg. and Stoz., even calls it probable itself. c. Ratio, because the Church did not prescribe these words in vain, but for this very purpose, that all good works of the penitent, although they arise from his own election, may be raised to the merit of sacramental satisfaction. This teaches all that 3 a. 28 where it says: And these things which the penitent adorned beyond the explicit confession receive greater force of expiation from the general promise, by which the priest says: Whatever good thing you have done etc. As regards this, such satisfaction is sacramental insofar as vice and clavis expiate the committed sin through its virtue. 508 « 3. A minor justification is licitly given for a cause: what kind, v. », gr. est, I. Great contrition. *(Unless repentance is necessary for medicine)*. II.

Weakness of the soul, or of the body, on account of which one fears, so as to fulfill a greater. III Tempus Jubilaei, vel Indulgentiae. plenarie. Thus. Laymann, "Cap. I." Dub.

IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. 455. It is certain that the penitent should be entrusted to the confessor as a judge and as a physician, per se speaking, with fitting satisfaction; for it belongs to the judge to impose penalties commensurate with the crimes, and to the physician to prescribe appropriate remedies both for diseases contracted and for those to be avoided in the future: thus from 8 where it is said: Therefore the priests of the Lord should, according to spirit and prudence suggested, for the quality of sins and the capacity of penitents, impose salutary and suitable satisfactions; lest by conniving at sins and treating penitents more indulgently, they become participants in very light works for very serious crimes. Let it be held in view, that the satisfaction which they impose should not be regarded merely as conducive to the custody of the new life... but also as presumptuous with regard to the vengeance and chastisement of past sins. Therefore is it incumbent upon penitents to fulfill the Sacrament of Penance in order to satisfy the divine justice demanding reparation for the injury inflicted, and to offer a penal satisfaction to God. Hence the Catechism rightly observes that, so that penitents may more clearly understand their own antecedent prevention of

sin, it will sometimes be profitable for them to signify the punishment which has been constituted according to the prescription of the ancient Canons (which are called penitential) for certain sins prescribed therein.

We have said, speaking per se; for by accident the confessor diminishes penances on account of just causes, namely those described above at Busemb. and signally (as commonly the Doctors teach) on account of the weakness of the soul which labors in the penitent, and on account of which he consents to a proportionate satisfaction but will not fulfill it. Thus D. Thorn. suppl. Question 18 art. 4 (cujus verba inferius referen- tur) . 38 sect. 4 n. 4. cum communi, Anacl. pag. 634 n. 25. . 3 cap. 11 n. 8. Abelly page 206, verse 3, and page 248, as well as others frequently, followers of a more rigid opinion, such as Habert de 5. Reason, because although 456 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, according to the reason of divine justice there is required a satisfaction adequate for the sins committed, yet it must be held as acceptable by divine clemency. The power of penitential virtues is both bodily and spiritual. Wherefore it is said in Trent: That divine clemency be fitting, that our sins not be remitted to us without any satisfaction. Note that without any satisfaction; therefore God demands not an entire satisfaction, but only some satisfaction from His own clemency.

Et hoc facit id, quod dixit D. Thomas: Si contingat quod sacerdos imponat satisfactionem mitigiorem... nihilominis pœnitens ad aliquid ulterius obligatur; quod si in hac vita non perficiet, in purgatorium exsolvet. Neither does it hinder that in the same place it is said, as was related above, that penalties should be imposed according to the prudence suggested by the quality of the crimes and the salutary and suitable capacity of the penitents. Note concerning the facility of penance, that is, regarding their bodily and mental infirmity; and note concerning what is salutary and fitting, whence rightly says the Author of the Office. Confessio apud Crouij libri 1 quaestio 50: «(Salutare...non sunt satisfactiones, quibus præ gravitate subeundis vix pares esse pœnitentes videantur, adeò ut in eorum perniciem...vertant): Sic praesumptum explicat Abelly pagina 206 verbum illud Salutare: « (Idest, ait, utiles ad salutem pœnitentium; Confessarius enim hoc solum ob oculos habere debet ut pœniten- tis saluti consulat). » Apositè praesumptum Antoine, quidam quemvis hic Auctor merito numeratur inter Scriptores rigi- diores temporis nostri, tamen articulus 3 de satisfactionibus sic dicit: « Satisfactiones vindicativæ ut sint salutare et convenientes debent esse proportionalæ non solùm multitudini et gravitati peccatorum sed praesumpto facultati conditioni et dispositionibus pœnitentis...neque enim

salu- tares sunt pœnitentiae tam graves ac diuturnæ ut specta- tā pœnitentis fragilitate, periculum sit ne eas omittat; nam tunc in ejus exitium vertentur. » In hoc autem Sacramento magis intenditur emendatio et salus paenitentis quam satisfactio pro poena.

If therefore it is expedient, Chapter I. Doubt. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. For the spiritual good of the penitent, a lighter penalty can be imposed than he deserves. Wherefore S. 21 says: The Confessor ought to assign a penance such as he believes will verisimilitudinously suffice for a penitent truly contrite, lest by violating it himself he make it worse for him.

And the Rituale Parisiense says: The confessor should question the penitent whether he can perform the penance imposed upon him, so that according to his own prudence he may change or lessen it. » Thus Antoine. The same is felt by Gonet to, 6 p., 463, Collig. 2, where he says: "On account of a reasonable cause, the confessor sometimes imposes a lighter penance, lest if the penitent be oppressed by a grave illness, or there be a danger that would be deterred by Confession, or the imposed penance not be fulfilled." Wherefore Gerson in the Rule of Morals, p. 2, c. de Poen., says: It is safer to lead confessors to Purgatory with a small penance, which is spontaneously accepted and verisimilitude suggests will be fulfilled, than to precipitate them into Hell with great penance that will not be fulfilled. And Cajet in Summa v. Satisfac-tio satisfacti gratiae ait: Satisfac-tio debiliter dispositae poenitentis danda est ut parvulus ignis foveatur et ne apposita palea suffocetur apositis lignis desuper.) » Item Scotus d. 15 q. 1 art. 5 loquens de poenitente qui animo est infirmus ait: Si adeò est delicatus quod non velit jejunium adimplere imò si nullam poenitentiam vult recipere absolvendus est et non respuendus ne cadat in desperationem.

And thus he concludes: That which one imposes upon oneself willingly, and which is believed to be fulfilled, must be so considered. That is confirmed by the Ritual of Rome on the Sacrament of Penance: Lastly, the penitentiary shall impose a salutary and suitable satisfaction, as much as his spirit and prudence suggest, having regard to reason, condition, sex, and status, and also to the disposition of the penitents. Note on the dispositionis. Saint Charles, according to Con-5u. cinam p. 346 n. 14 thus prescribed: Penances of the canons, as the times bring forth, he (the priest) shall mitigate out of his own charity and prudence, so far as the circumstances of the sins require, in which there will be a reason for the contribution... Nor 458 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance—however, they

consider their light sins to be such because small penances have been given for them; but this was done so that they would not desist from what had been imposed for the reason of correcting their faults (note) with danger to their salvation. Therefore penitents will be held worthy of being revered, so that besides the works imposed upon them, they will seek to offer many other things presumptuously. The same Saintly Archbishop also added: Let penance be imposed such as the penitent judges to be able to fulfill.

Therefore sometimes, if it shall seem expedient, question him whether he can perform, or doubt whether he can perform, the penance imposed upon him; otherwise he will change it, or lessen it. Saint John Chrysostom. Thus Matthew says: Although we err by imposing slight penance, is it not better to give preference to the reason of mercy than to harshness? Item homilie quarundam. Just as if you place a bundle on the shoulders of one who cannot bear it, necessarily either he will discard the bundle or it will break him under its weight: so too to a man whom you burden with a heavy penance that he cannot bear, necessarily either he will reject his penance, or, receiving it while he cannot endure it, he will be scandalized and sin more greatly.

This is confirmed by the Sacred Doctor himself, who writes that the Apostle says (2 Cor. 2:6 and 7): It suffices for one such as he to receive this reproof from many, so that thereby you may more abundantly give and console him, lest the abundance of his sadness be swallowed up, who is such as he. Wherefore Chrysostom thus proceeds: From this we are taught that penance ought not only to be moderated according to the nature of sins, but also according to the presumptuous thoughts, dispositions, and habits of sinners. Homil. 4 in II ad Cor. Confirmat D. Thomas (cujus regulam: dicit qu. 18 art. 4: Pane satisfactorye in Canone determinato non competunt omnibus, sed variande sunt secundum arbitrium Sacerdotis... Congruent ergo Medicus aliquando prudenter non dat medicinam ita efficacem, quae ad morbicurationem sufficiat, ne propter debiliteri naturae majus periculum oriatur; ita Sacerdos divino instinctu motus, non semper totam penam, quae uni peccato debetur, injungit, ne infirmus ea magnitudine pene Cap. I. Duh. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. Despairs completely and totally withdraws from penance. Et quod hic S. Doctor non solùm loquatur de imbecillitate corpus- ris, sed etiam de praesumptu pænitentis animi patet ex contextu ejusdem articuli; et clarius ex Quod 1. 3 art. 28 ubi dicit: Videtur autem satis convenientes, quod Sacerdos non oneret pænitentem gravit onere satisfactionis, quia congruent parvus ignis à multis lignis suppositis de facto ex- tinguitur; ita posset contingere, quod parvus

affectus contritionis in pænitente nuper excitatus propter grave onus satisfactionis extingueretur, peccatore totaliter des- perante; unde melius est, quod Sacerdos pænitenti indi- cet, quanta pænitentia esset sibi propeccatis injungenda, et injungat sibi nihilominus aliquid quod pænitens tolerabili- ter ferat: ex cujus impletione assuefiat, ut majora impleat, quae praesumptum Sacerdos injungere non attentasset. And these things, which are beyond the express injunction, receive a greater force of expiation for past sins, from that general injunction, whereby the Priest says: Whatever good thing you have done is to be taken as in remission of your sins. And the same Angelicus in Opusc. 65 §. 4, after having said: The priest should not impose a penance so grave that the penitent would totally despair... nor so light that he contemplates the sin with complacency. Then he adds: Nevertheless, it is more fitting to impose a lesser penance than a greater one, because we are excused before God through much mercy rather than through excessive severity; for such a deficiency will be made up in Purgatory.

The same [author] more forcefully implies in Saint Anthony 3 p. t. 16 c. 20 at the beginning, where he says: “Nam est autem satis rationabilis causa non dandi hujusmodi paenitentias; indispositio paeni- tentium, praesumptum quia aliquando non sufficeret tempus vitae; nam ut dicunt Raymund. et Hostiens. debet Confessor dare talem paenitentiam, quam credat veri- similiter illum implere, ne ipsam violando deterius contingat.” Si autem magnis peccatis flagitiosus fuerit et dicat se paenitere, sed non posse duram paenitentiam agere, hunc ad hoc confessori animet ostendens ei gravitatem peccatorum et per consequens penarum, ut sic tandem ei injungat paenitentiam quam libenter suscipiat. Et si sacerdos non possit gaudere de omnimoda purgatione ejus, saltem gaudet quod liberatum a gehenna transmittat ad purgatorium. Itaque (ut dicit Host.) Confessor nullatenus debet permittere, ut peccator desperatus recedat a se, sed potius imponat ei unum Pater noster vel alium leve, et ut alia bona quae fecerit et mala quae toleraverit sint ei in poenitentiam concordante S. c. 10 n. 46. Cross n. 1255 et Lugo l.c. ex D. Antonino, ut supra, quod sit causa praesumpta satis justa minuendi poenitentiam, ut poenitens magis amore afficiatur erga hoc Sacramentum. Thus likewise speaks the Author in the end 3: «(Maximè debeatur studium ut poenitentes necessarias poenitentias sine magno incommodo et absque confusione adimplere possint; experientia quippe quotidiana docet, importunas et nimis onerosas satisfactions poenitentium animos frangere et ab earum executione removere:) » Et «(Poenitentia debet esse salutare et conveniens, hoc est praemio loco attendi debet ad utilitatem poenitentis, ne scilicet laquei ei injiciantur ut nova peccata committat; ex quo potissimum capite excusari potest hodierna praxis qua leves poenitentiae imponuntur pro gravissimis peccatis; id enim saepè fit propter spiritualem infirmitatem poenitentium,

quia gravioribus poenitentiis scandalizabuntur et vel Confessionem fugient vel certè Confessarios imperitos adibunt. »

However, the penitents are to be instructed concerning the insufficiency of the satisfaction imposed. » Therefore, wisely, Chapter I. Dub. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. IV. 46r, St. Thomas of Villanova remarks in his Sermon. Bear.

VI. after Mass. Rejoice): By this my judgment you will be perfected, if you have imposed easy penance upon me, we shall experience a sharper one. Best practice. From all these things it is gathered how imprudently the confessors conduct themselves who impose great penances which the prudent penitents foresee as not being fulfilled. How many more unlearned confessors are found (I speak of one experienced in missions, in which I have been engaged for nearly thirty years), who do not hesitate to absolve those who either are tempted by a proximate occasion of sinning or are recidivists in a state of indisposition, and foolishly think that they are curing them gravely by imposing heavy penances; hence it happens that although they accept the penance as part of their absolution, yet after obtaining the absolution, because no remedy is prescribed to them whereby they might be preserved from relapsing soon in misery, they are easily relapsed and did not fulfill the penance. And being deterred by its severity, thereafter they shun confession, and thus remain longer in sin.

But I think it should be noted (except in the case of grave infirmity, or of very great contrition, as was said above, n. 507) that the Confessor would not act well if he imposed a penance per se light for mortal sins, which would impose a light obligation. For although, if it shall be expedient, a work may be imposed which, in respect to the sins, is light; nevertheless, regularly speaking, some grave penance should always be enjoined, which inflicts a grave obligation. « 4. It cannot be enjoined at the entrance into religion, 1. 1. 1, as Sa, v., teaches. Satisfaction, because that would be excessively harsh. Public penance, si sit periculum revelandae Confessionis, alias aliud interdum pro publico peccato potest esse et expedire.

As regards the first point, it is common among the Doctors that entrance into religion cannot be imposed as a penance. Thus 1. 17 n. 166 cum ., Sylv. et Henr. ex . 2 quæst. 62 art. 2. Whether, however, it can be imposed upon someone, that he may receive the Sacrament of Matrimony? Leand affirms. D. 9 q. 35. with certain ones, in a case wherein, by which the Confessor knows the Marriage to be that person's necessary remedy.

But rather: this is condemned. Chapter and verse: 5:2. As regards the second point: public penance is certain not to be imposed for a hidden sin, as commonly stated in Croix number 1265, pages 236 and elsewhere; because, as St. Thomas teaches, for hidden sins, however grave they may be, no manifest penance should be imposed. As for a public sin, there is doubt whether public penance can be imposed? They deny; Regulus and Vesepiscopus commonly assert that it can be affirmed. cited. 37 sect. 6 n. 3. Cross n. 1264.

Roncaglia contra 1. quaestio 7. Antoine p. 517 R. 2. 39. nu. 238 et Escob. 1. 17 n. 154 cum idque expressè docuit: 14 q. 1 art. 5 Question 1 ubi dixit, oportere ut peccatum publicum habeat medicinam publicam. It is proved 1. from cap. Manifesta 1. de Poenit. et Rem., where it is said: Manifesta peccata non sunt occult correptione purganda. And Trent, Session 24: On Repentance, chapter 8, where it is said: For this (that is, for a public sinner) a fitting penance should be publicly imposed according to the mode of his guilt. And many understand this to refer to the presumptuous Council speaking on the sacramental forum from the cited AA.

It does not hinder to say that such public penance would be a manifestation of Confession; for since it is imposed with the consent of the penitent and necessarily must be rendered if he wishes to be absolved: rather, that manifestation proceeds from the free act of the penitent, than from the command of the Confessor. Here they say. Roncag. et Th., ut supra, Confessarium non solum posse, sed praesumptum aliquando tenèri. hanc publicam Cap. I. Bubble. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. To impose that penance. However, this is rightly warned against by Reg. in prax. 6, namely that honor be publicly restored to someone publicly dishonored. Moreover; si publica poenitentia non sit ità necessaria, meritò dicunt præfati AA. non debeo Confessarium illam imponere reluc-tanti, cum aliter possit salus obtineri poenitentis, et scandalum reparari, nempe per publicam frequenta-tionem Sacramentorum; visitationes Ecclesiarum, auditionem Missarum, ingressum in aliquam Congregationem, ubi pietatis opera exercentur, et similia. Auditionem Missarum, ingressum in aliquam Congregationem, ubi pietatis opera exercentur, et similia. Here Fagnanus in d. cap. Manifesta refers that the Sacred Congregation did not wish to declare whether public penance should be imposed in the sacramental forum for public sins. « 5.

Even though it might be, and sometimes on account of the frailty of temptations presumptuously expedient, urge another debt due, or a precept, verbum grat. Mass hearing on the feast day, etc., as Suarez, Vasquez teach in tract. 6 c. 15, and others. Wherefore if a scrupulous

person frequently returns to the confessional, within brief time always confessing anew, it is not always necessary to impose new penance, since the due work may be enjoined beforehand. Good. Henry, as those same authors teach, and in Doubtbook 8, Article 4, Volume 4, Response 241. Therefore, it is doubted: can an alternative debt be imposed as penance?

They deny that it is always necessary to impose some supererogatory work for penance; because another work commanded to be performed elsewhere must be done by the penitent, even if he does not confess. But commonly and rightly Lugo affirms d. 25 n. 67. 1 c. 14 p. 5. . 38 sect. 6: 464 Lib. VI. Tract. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance, Chapter 12, Article 28, Number 246. Escob. l. 17 n. 170. Duard. p. 21 § 1 nu. 10 cum 2 cum Cou et Candido ac Victor etc., ratio quia opus illud jam praeceptum, cum sit satisfactorium, bene potest per claves elevari ad meritum praesumptae satisfactionis sacramentalis unde congruent qui die festo audit Missam praesumptum ex voto debitem duplex habet meritum ita qui implet opus alias praeceptum injunctum simul in poenitentiam. They, however, rightly caution against this, namely, that unless the Confessor expressly imposes another precept, it will be understood that the supererogatory work is imposed. See Palaus loc. cit., qui citat 10 dub. 8. . 6. . 1 tr. 3 d. 19 p. 1 n. 4.

Cross n. 1281. 235. n. 30 cum Bon. Mercero, et Diana. It is doubted 2. Whether, if a penitent immediately after absolution commits another sin, it suffices for him to impose the same penance? They affirm this, but justly they reproach it; Palaus, p. 21 § 2 n. 10. For although an act otherwise commanded can suitably be imposed as penance, as was said above, nevertheless an act commanded under the same title cannot be a sacramental satisfaction. §4 « 6.

Even though an internal work may be imposed presumptively, as stated on page 4, treatise 4, response 241, commonly: nevertheless it should be external and afflictive, such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving. For almsgiving is fitting for the avaricious, fasting and abstinence for those luxurious in body; but whether clearly imposed or not, Chapter I. Dub. V. On the essence of this Sacrament. 465 It is fitting that prayers be recited for the dead; it can be doubted whether Vega t. 2 c. 64 and Joan. 16 num. 1 deny: affirm more probablistically 37 Dub. 4.

Card. de Lugo d. 25 sect. 5. See 54. Here it must be noted, that prayer as well as almsgiving, and whatever other good work commanded in the Sacrament of Penance can count as a penal and afflictive work, according

to what Doctors commonly teach, because with regard to us, by reason of the state of nature's fall, any virtuous act has a reason for penance, because having lost original justice, we are all inclined towards earthly and temporal benefits. Thus Valentinus, tom. 4, de decimo septimo, quaest. 14., punct. 3. Castrop. d. un. p. 21 § 3 n. 1. . 6. de Pitigiam. 2. p. dist. 15. q. 1. art. 3. concl. 1. et . 6. de cum aliis, et Busemb. ut suprâ.

The same author, being well-versed in the new doctrine of the book, where the title is (Instructions per Novas) and he said: "Ma who pays attention that we do not call nor esteem useless any penance whatever it may be which is enjoined in the Sacrament, since it is certain that even a simple sign of the Cross joined with this Sacrament is efficacious for satisfaction; much more so in the present state of fallen nature, every good work is in some way afflicting and penal." This is well confirmed by Saint Francis de Sales in his Philothea, chapter 23, page 201, where he says: One has a penalty to fast, another to serve the sick, to confess, to preach, to assist the desolate, and to make orisons and similar exercises; this penalty (namely praying, etc.) is worth more than that other (namely fasting); for not only does it subdue the body equally, but it produces much more desirable fruits. Especially is it confirmed by St. Thomas, who says: Every prayer has a reason for satisfaction, because although it has sweetness of spirit, it nevertheless has an affliction of flesh; (as Gregory says in his Homily 14 on Ezekiel.) While the strength of intimate love grows in us, doubtless the strength of the flesh is weakened: (St. Thomas) Book IV: Chapter 66. Treatise. IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. This is doubted here. Whether an internal work can be imposed is denied by Sancins' 16 n. 1 and Alens. ac Almain in 38 sect. 6 num. 2 because penance, since it is a part of the Sacrament, ought to be sensible. But rightly with the common opinion they affirm, Suarez and Lugo, d. 25 n. 67. Pont. de Matr.

I. 1 cap. 7 n. 4. Sporer n. 563 et sic respondent rationi contrariae. Doubt is cast: Can an applied work be imposed upon the dead? Sancius d. 36 tum. 1 et Vega c. 64 cas. 4 negant quia tunc opus non proderit poenitenti ad satisfaciendum pro seipso, ut tenetur. But more commonly and more probably they affirm it.

Lugo d. 25 n. 62 cum 30. Sporer n. 570. etc. in Cath. In Romans where it is said: therefore the measure of guilt will be tempered by the proportion of satisfaction for all. But from every kind of satisfaction number especially it is fitting to prescribe penitents, that they devote certain and defined days to prayer, and may make prayers for all things, especially for those who have departed this life in the Lord. Reason, because every alms-deed is

truly meritorious, and although the satisfaction of that work is then applied to the dead, yet the satisfaction of the penitent's good will, which applies this work; itself yields. « 7.

It is sometimes permissible to impose a cessation from another good work (e.g., excessive corporal affliction, or some abstinence instead of Communion) for the purpose of promoting a greater good for the penitent, if a prudent confessor judges that such an end should be achieved. Salas, against John of St. Joan. It is doubted whether a cessation from some good work can be imposed, namely from Communion, fasting, etc., Chapter II, Section I. Dub. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 467. Sancius denies this in his third treatise because this would not be an act of merit. But commonly rightly affirming with Busenb., and others Lugo d. 25 n. 64. Sporer n. 573 with Suarez, and Rod. Of whose solution.

However rightly Lugo notes that it is not proper to regularly impose such penance; in fact, it cannot be imposed at all when the omission of that work might perhaps provide occasion for others to judge what was enjoined as penance from the confessional, according to the aforementioned n. 512. « 8. Even though it can immediately be imposed after absolution yet still should it be done before, so that the order of judgment may be preserved. See 4 resp. » 136 and p. 5 t. 13 res. 36 where from the final chapter, and Och. » teaches, although custom has it that it be done thus, nevertheless not as having brought about an obligation. »

Response 2. A penitent is commonly held under a grave obligation to receive and fulfill penance, if it be reasonable; as the common opinion against Cajetan holds. Sylv. . lib. 7 cap. 2. 15 R. 52. But to this I do not assent, according to what I said at the end, 510, namely: commonly speaking, because it is probable that venial sin only obliges in cases following such a sequence: I. If it has been imposed for merely venial sins.

If those cited are opposed to Henry. If for mortals another Confessions. III. Omission of a part is not serious in the confession of mortal sins; or an assumed omission of the whole, if it be slight, e.g., one Miserere. They say that omitting one Miserere presumptuously is to (consider it) omitted entirely. 468 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. 21 §4 n. 11 and Lugo d. 25 n. 74. Rosarium vero B.

Virginis, etsi quinque decadum, minime dici potest materia leve) IV. If the confessor refused to bind under a mortal sin; because, since he can impose penance freely and without any obligation, as Suarez proves here in d. 38 sect. 7. Henry. Fillastre, de Sacrificio, d. 10, dub. 8, n. 65: contra (Et sic insinuat agendum P. Segneri in suo Parocho Instr. » and Croix I. 6 p. 2 num 1240: si penitens non accipere penitentiam impositam.) Vide et p. 4 t. 4.

R. 82. V. He is liberated from the burden of penance by the plenary indulgence, unless it be medicinal; this R. 36 and de Lugo teach against Val. March. et) » I have spoken 2. » If it be reasonable; because if it be just, graver and more difficult, the Confessor would not wish to moderate it. Therefore, if without absolution departing from one Priest's judgment a penitent should send his sins to another Priest’s judgment, he will not sin gravely, provided that he is not obliged to do so; or if it be altogether unjust, or if the penitent cannot fulfill it, or if he has forgotten it.

Then one is not bound to anything else, even though it would be expedient that he who, whether culpably or without fault having forgotten, seeks in his subsequent confession to impose a similar burden upon himself. Ita Conin. et Sylv. qui putant talem Confessionem esse repetendam: quod praeter citatos negat praesumptum 56. Here many doubtful matters occur for discussion. It is doubted whether a penitent should be bound to accept just penance, which the Confessor imposes? Three are the opinions.

Primam negat, quam tenet Cajetanus. Opusc. tr. 6 qu. 2 ad 2. et probabilem putant Sporer n. 548 et secunda sententia, quam tenent Cap. I. Dub. V. On the essence of this Sacrament. 469 25 n. 68 et Soto, Zerola, 12. dicit, eum posse non acceptare, sed si acceptet, teneri ad eam exequendam.

The third common and true opinion, which Lenet expresses in section 38, paragraph 7, note 2 (who calls those opposed temerarious, Lugo, I, c.), where he calls our opinion certain with Vasquez et al., with Saint Thomas, Paludanus, and P. Soto, states that one commits sin who does not accept penance or does not wish to fulfill it, yet desires to receive absolution. Reason, because, as Blessed十四pson 所輸入之內容為英文，因此我將其翻譯成中文如下： Reason, 因為, 正如伯多祿第十四世在信函中所教導。 Encycl.

Among the precedents. (in Bullar. tom. 3 p 170 § 67.) The confessor is bound to impose a just penance, and so the penitent is bound to accept it. However, it is probable that, if to the penitent it seems that that penance is

justly more grievous or excessively burdensome in regard to his weakness, then if the confessor will not wish to moderate it, he could still depart without grave fault without absolution and go to another confessor, as they say with d. 38 sect. 7 n. 4. 228. n. 550. Hoc tamen intelligendum, si poenitentia illa vere sit irrationabilis, vel impar debilibus viribus poenitentis; nam si contra poenitentia facile posset ab eo impleri, et nollet ex mera desidia illam acceptare, ac cum levi absolvi vellet, non videtur posse excusari a peccato gravi, quia (ut bene ait Lugo n. 69.) congruent peccaret Sacerdos imponendo levem poenitentiam sine justa causa pro gravibus culpis, ita peccaret poenitens volens sine causa recipere absolutionem cum poenitentia justo leviori. Doubt is cast. Whether a penitent sins gravely if he omits to fulfill a severe penance imposed for venial or confessed mortal sins?

It is commonly held that, if a light penance is imposed, there is no obligation to fulfill it under grave circumstances, even if the entire penance is omitted; Lugo d. 25 n. 74. Renzi cap. 2 470 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. sect. 3, qu. 14, 38 sect. 7 n. 5. Cross n. 1278. with Averra, and others frequently. Reason, because a light matter is not capable of a grave obligation. It does not hinder that the Sacrament remain incomplete, for that is already complete essentially; and integral completion through a light matter does not obligate except lightly according to the matter. The doubt arises when the matter of penance is grave.

The first probable and more common opinion states that a grave sin is committed by omitting that which ought to be done, as Lugo and Pall say. II. c. B. q. 5 s. 3 p. 4 n. 4. Roncaglia cap. 2 q. 2 R. 2. Concina p. 423 n. 11. Escob. lib. 17 n. 206. with and in conjunction with Nunno.

Reason, because the weight or lightness of this obligation is not taken from the gravity of the cause, namely the confessed sin, but from the matter of the precept, that is to say, the penance imposed. The second opinion, however, sufficiently probable, denies this obligation to be grave, as in chapter 15 number 7. Diana p. 3 tract. 4 R. 136. and probablem putant Lugo n. 76. Mazzotta to. 3 p. 381. cum cum Soto Palud. Fill. Ratio, quia hoc casu materia satisfactionis imposita non est necessaria in quantum est gravis; unde congruent Confessarius non te- nebatur, imo nec poterat illam imponere sub gravi, ita nec penitens sub gravi adimplere.

It does not hinder to say that penance is not to be commensurated with the

sin itself, but rather with the temporal fullness due on account of the sin; for if this were so, certainly grave penance ought to be imposed for each venial sin, since every venial sin, indeed even the gravest, deserves a penalty. I nevertheless feel it appropriate to say with Roncaglia (to whom the presumed consent agrees), that if by chance those venial sins very much dispose the penitent to mortal sin, then the confessor might impose a grave penance upon him, so as to remove him from the danger of committing mortal sin; and then the penitent would be bound, if he wishes to abstain. Dub. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. To solve it, to accept it and to fulfill it.

Furthermore, I hold that, if a penitent does not perform contrition worthy of the confessed mortal sins adequately, then when he again subjects himself to the same sins with the keys, the confessor can properly impose a severe penance; and the penitent, if he accepts it, is bound to fulfill it. Et autem circumstantiae poenitentiae impositae tenet poenitens implere sub mortali, scilicet ad reciendum coronam flexis genibus, brachiiis extensis, et similia? Res. nulli dubium, quin omissio circumstan- tiae saltem venialis sit futura, vel vero sit futura vel ne mortalis, pendet ex molestia levi aut gravi, quam affert circumstantia, vel per se, vel respective ad poenitentem, prout significavit Confessarius poenitentiam impone- nus; ita communiter 1. 4 c. 12 n. 8. Lugo, dated the 25th day, number 93. In part 5, article 2, number 4. Renzi c. 2 sect. 3 q. 16. . 4 c. 2 n. 14. et Croix n. 1280. cum Dicast.

Opposed, etc., it is doubted [or: it is in doubt] three. Whether a confessor may impose severe penance for grave sins, but under an obligation until the sixth day? The first opinion denies it; this is held by Renzi in chapter 2 section 3 question 14 and with Coninch and Nunno. Reason, because although a legislator can obligate in grave matters only under a light penalty, yet in this Sacrament the Confessor is not considered as a legislator, but as a simple minister, when he acts there in the name of God; hence he cannot impose a grave matter under a light penalty. The second opinion is more commonly affirmed, which Busemb. holds as mentioned above with Henry and Fagundez, III 7 n. 5.

Filliuc tr. 8 n. 54. P. Segneri Instructio ad librum IV caput II n. 6. et probabilem vocat n. 2. articuli VI cum Medina et Diana. Reason, because truly (as even their adversaries concede, and as stated in lib. 1 n. 143), any legislator can prescribe a grave matter under a light one. The opposite reason does not hinder; for in this Sacrament the Confessor does not merely act in the place of Christ, but it is presumed that he is constituted by Christ as a true judge and legislator. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. The one who, by virtue entrusted to him, remits sins and binds precepts in regard to the obligation of satisfaction to be fulfilled: hence the weightiness of this obligation does not arise from the power of the Sacrament, but from the command of the Confessor. This second proposition seems to me very probable per se speaking, but I would not approve it if a Confessor should wish to impose entire penance under a light matter according to this doctrine for grave sins except in the case of grievous infirmity or of most intense contrition, or some other rare case wherein it would seem altogether expedient for the salvation of the penitent; I judge indeed that the Tridentine precept should always restrain the Confessor from imposing any serious work under a heavy obligation (as I have already said in n. 5 at the end); although it may be light with respect to the number and gravity of the sins. Præfata ergo sententia deservire poterit ad hoc tantùm, ut Confessarius postquam imposuit aliquam poenitentiam graven, aliam graviorem injungat sub levi; ut si poenitens illam implebit sacramentaliter satisfaciat; si verò negliget non gravetur culpa gravi.

Et sic puto rectè se gerere Confessarium; cum enim spectet imperfectionem paenitentis, possit Confessarius primam tantum gravem paenitentiam imponere sub præcepto, et graviorem sub consilio praescribere, melius consulat bono paenitentis, imponendo illam graviorem sub levi, ut omnia opera injuncta eleventur ad meritum satisfactionis sacramentalis. However, I least approve of that which Medina says as above, namely, that the Confessor can sometimes impose penance without any obligation; this I say is altogether improbable; for a legislator can both enforce and not enforce a law, but if he enforces it, he cannot do so without obligation, since a law must necessarily at least obligate under some condition; for a law which does not oblige is not a law, but counsel. 519 Dubitatur 4. At the time of the Jubilee, or of plenary Indulgence, can the Confessor grant absolution without any enjoined penance? The first opinion affirms this, and Lugo holds to this on December 27, number 21. Section 10, number 10. Chap. I. Dub.

V. On the essence of this Sacrament. 475 with Toletum, and Sa, . 6 art. r n. 1. v. Fifth (yet they limit it: and the same [doctrine] he taught in question 25 article 1 ad 3 where, addressing the objection that a priest cannot remit penance since this is part of the Sacrament, he responds: By doing Indulgences, he pays the penalty which was due, from the common goods of the Church.) Submits however to 4. Tamen consulendum est eis, qui Indulgentias corquēn tur, ne propter hoc ab operibus poenitentiae injunctis abstineant. The reason for this judgment is that penance is principally imposed to satisfy temporal punishment, which has already been entirely remitted through an indulgence; Nevertheless, contrary to this, what is

stated in Concilium page 407 number 6 must be held.

Roncaglia cap. 2 quaest. 7 et Croix num. 1273. cum Filliuc. Benedictus Pontifex. X. in cited. Epist. Incid. Among the past ones. (See in Bullar. to. 3 p. 170 § 65) it condemns the contrary opinion as laxer, saying that it cannot be thought that a true penitent seeks Indulgences and wishes to exempt himself from sacramental penance on this pretext.

Reason 1 is because, in order for the Penitent to be certainly released from a certain due penance through Indulgences, he should have been certain that he would obtain it; but this is very uncertain; hence, he cannot satisfy with a certain debt through an uncertain absolution. Reason 2 because, although a certain person might gain Indulgences, he should nevertheless always fulfill some penance (which is an integral part of the Sacrament), so that the Sacrament does not remain mutilated. I said some penance; for commonly and most probably, besides the aforementioned for the first opinion, it is said in three chapters eleven notes eight. Sporer n. 258. . 248. et cum Sofo, et Henr. causa Indulgentiarum bene posse à Confessario poenitentiam diminui, modò aliqua imponatur, quia per eam integratur Sacramentum, et contra per Indulgentias 474 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. It is probably sufficient for the temporal punishment due to goods common to the Church, as St. Thomas teaches in the aforementioned place §20. Is it doubted whether, if the penitent has forgotten the penance imposed, he should be required to repeat the Confession so as to receive another penance? The first opinion, which S. and with Sylvius and others hold, says that one should at least repeat his principal sins, so that a fitting penitence may be imposed upon him: because the penitent ought to take care, as far as possible, that the Sacrament become whole; for he who is bound by the end, is also bound by the means. The second however is the common sentiment, which those hold who on the 25th day of Lugo, note 87. Sporer n. 552. with common, Croix n. 1275. 7. Holz m. n. 617. . 6 art. 2 n. 6.

Diana, tractatus 4, Rationes 241, n. 272, n. 244 cum negat obligationem hanc etiamsi poenitens culpabiliter oblitus fuerit poenitentiam; ut specialiter notant Ratio, quia ex una parte non tenetur amplius ad poenitentiam, cum illius impletio facta sit ei impossibilis; ex altera non videtur extare haec obligationem repetendi Confessionem, ut integretur Sacramentum, cum nemo videatur tenèri repetere sua peccata semper ac ipsa directè fuerint remissa; hoc enim gravissimum esset onus. Both opinions are probable. But Coninck rightly observed in his discussion on doubt number nine, note eighty-six. Diana, Elb. . cc. et cum Cajei. Soto, quod talis poenitens teneretur utique, cum commodè posset, adire

Confessarium suum, si putaret illum adhuc memorem esse poenitentiae, quam injunxit; tunc enim ejus impletio est ei adhuc moraliter possibilis. 52a • Si quis poenitentiam implet in statu peccati mortalis, probabiliter quidem satisfacit praecepto, cum impleat ejus substantiam; peccat tamen, sed venialiter, ut docent Suarez, quia Cap. I. Dub.

IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. 475 He receives the part of the Sacrament unworthily, and an obstacle to the effect is produced, namely, the remission of punishment, which they teach will be recovered when the obstacle is removed. » Suarez, etc.) under which it is to be received, one can gravely sin by unduly delaying its reception, which is to be judged according to various circumstances. V. 53 et p. 5 t. 13 R. 38. But it is taught by 57 from Amico that it is not grave or mortal if it does not differ beyond eight days; and in this case it can be conveniently considered as soon as possible. » (Hoc merito communiter rejicitur cum c. 4 n. y Croix n. 1288; qui tamen excusat à mortalitate si dilatio sit ad mensem et poenitentia tantum vindicativa.

Ron- » raglia erò damnat de mortalì si differatur poenitentia » per 15 dies, sed hoc videtur nimis regidum; non re- » putatur enim gravis dilatio, quæ non affert grave » prajudiciem rei praeceptæ, ut ait Lugo dub. 25 » num. 91. qui addit num. 92. dilationem, ut sit gra- » vis, debeo esse ad longum tempus. Renzi autem q. 18. cum Cotonio, et Gloss. in l. fin. C. de Cens. » He says that a delay of less than six months is not a serious matter; » but this seems excessively lenient. » Similarly, he does not consider it to be a mortal sin if one is obliged to fast on Wednesday and defers it to the following day; or if one is obliged to communicate monthly and defers it by 6 or 8 days. » They affirm that it is not a mortal sin to defer the obligation of confession by four days, if a just cause excuses it. Item Palaus point 21 section 4 note 12. » when And he consents 6 476 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. R. in a certain way (properly admonishes) penance is not mediating, so that thereby the danger of relapsing be deferred. But Croix n. 1277. with Gob. et Steph. that to omit one from ten communions is not mortal, but to this I do not acquiesce.) * 532 Dubitatur i.

He who exists in mortal sin can fulfill the penance imposed. The first opinion denies this, and this view is held by Tabiena and Alens. Anchid. apud Ros. n. 70. And citing for himself D, Thomas, who in the Supplement, Question 14, Article 2, ad 2, says thus: It is necessary that works of satisfaction be acceptable to God, which charity gives them; and therefore works done without charity are not satisfactory. The reason for this judgment is that the sinner inflicts an injury upon the Sacrament by

placing an obstacle to the satisfaction imposed in the Sacrament. The second opinion, which Tournely Prælect holds.

R. 3. 490 art. 3. Antoine p. 519, denies that to be fulfilled if there is an actual affection towards a mortal sin while fulfilling it; but rather if it merely exists in the mortal sin; thus say the aforementioned authors. Rutio, quia ad satisfaciendum Deo non requiritur status gratiae sanctificantis, sed sufficit voluntas Deum placandi, quæ contrà deest in eo, qui habet actualem affectum ad peccatum. The third opinion is commonly and more probable affirmed universally, and these hold this. Section 38, chapter 8, note i. Conc. p. 359 n. 3. Lugo d. 25 n. 30 cum Palud.

Cajet soto, 15 cum Sa, præcepti, licet præcepti finis non obtineatur. It is responded to the text of D. Thomas, that there S. Doctor does not speak of the fulfillment of imposed satisfaction, but only of its merit, which cannot be had without charity. Dubitatur 2. Whether one sins who fulfills the imposed penance while existing in mortal sin? The Doctors agree that he does not commit a mortal sin in this; but others, such as Lugo on day 25 number 32 and Aversa, canon 10 number 70, who consider it probable, say that he in no way commits a Cap. I. Dub.

V. On the essence of this Sacrament. 477 why; because, as they say, no guilt is an obstacle to the mere remission of punishment. However, others hold it more probablistically true that this has committed a venial sin, because to put an obstacle to the effect of the partial working of the Sacrament cannot be excused by any culpa; thus 38 sect. 8 n. 7. tract. 13 n. 129. 1. c. they consider it presumptuously probabile. They say however Wig., on the contrary Scotus, "2." Penitence (presumptive medicinal) imposed under this condition: if again he falls, neither to be retained nor fulfilled, teaches Diana part. 6, t. 7, that the Confessor is neither judge nor physician of sins committing them. Res. 49. ex Palao, * (Et sic tenendum cum 1. 3 c. 8.

Nevertheless, this is to be understood, provided that a proportionate penance be imposed for the confessed sins. He who did not fulfill within the prescribed time is not therefore discharged. He says 18 that if a day is assigned for the fulfillment of penance, after its expiration there should no longer be any obligation to fulfill it; but rather the opposite must be observed according to R. 37. Renzi loco citato et Croix n. 1290 cum Aversa et Mendo. They say however ibid. Sporer, Con. et Gob., quod si alicui sit injunctum jejunium die Sabbati in honorem B.

M. V. post factum illius diei, non tenetur in altero. But this opinion does

not displease me, firstly because it is always principally intended by the Confessional for fastings, and secondly for days; secondly because, when the matter is divisible, he who cannot fulfill the whole is held to a part. 478 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. 526 § 4. It is possible to satisfy through another, whom the Confessor permits to do so, or who in himself cannot do it, as the Regula teaches. » Res. 141. But take heed here, Prop. 15 condemned by [the authority which said]: Proper penance substitutes another person for itself with its own proper authority.) Yet this is not binding unless the confessor wishes it. * An obligation satisfying for another; at the same time for oneself it may be, some add, while others more probingly deny it, as Saurs has it. » 5. Not necessarily fulfilled before Communion. 527 » (Here notice four Propositions condemned by Alexander VIII, namely Prop. 16.

Order introduced the disposition for satisfying absolution before communion was not due to litigiosity or institution of the Church, but rather the very law and prescription of Christ, and in some way the nature of the thing itself dictated this. Prop. 17. By that same rule soon to be remitting, the order of penance is reversed. Prop. 18. The modern custom regarding the administration of the Sacrament of Penance, although it be supported by the authority of many men and confirmed by long usage, nevertheless is not held by the Church for use, but for abuse. Prop. 22.

Sacrilege are those judged who claim the right to receive Communion before having performed due penance for their sins. You ask: Who can commute penance, and how? Respondeo: De juste causa quilibet sacerdos hoc potest, si quis de novo ei confiteatur, ut habet communis sententia contra Sotum et Vasquez; saltem si peccata non sint reservata: imo praesumptive probabiliter, etiamsi talia fuerint, ut habet Sine. Nova sacramenti administratione potest id solus sacerdos qui injunxit, si adhuc recordetur status penitentiae, et hic ad eum recurrat tempore tam breve, ut moraliter idem judicium ceneri possit, v.g. intra hebdomadam. Henry et alii 4. » Nevertheless even after a longer interval. 46 and p. 9 tr. 6: R. 57 Cap. I. Dub. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 479 against Ita and Sylv. Fill. King. Bag. and Cardinal of Lugo, against . . Bejam, 53' and p. 2 t. 1 misc. R. 53t, qui dicunt, presumptum aliud posse, non repetitis peccatis. That judgment, although not grounded in reason, seems nevertheless to be extrinsically probable in practice (citing this for it adduces 14).

Authors say that it is customary practice; whether in the confessional or by confessors themselves, to be able to serve when a penitent with difficulty brings himself to repeat his sins, or the time does not permit; especially if from confession (for there and not elsewhere should it occur) they have some confused knowledge of the sins committed prior to the present state of penance, through the testimony of the penitent himself. Such [is the] opinion, chapter 9, canon 4, note n, number 22. Card de Lugo d. 25 sect. 6 n. 107 et 109. Response 3. The penitent himself cannot change his penance from one evidently better to a worse one, as Sanchez teaches in book 6, chapter mor. Conin d. 10 art. 12 n. 13 Rugin. et alii: etsi contrarium probabile dicat R. 53 et p. 5 tract. 14 res. 73 ex Porc. et temerarium, Card de Lugo communi Theologorum, et fidelium sensui repugnare diuit d. 23 sect. 6 n. 95.

"Dubitatur i." An poenitens optans poenitentiam injunctam sibi commutari, teneatur Confessionem factam repetere? Resp. Si confitetur ei medipenso confessario, non erit opus eam repetere, dummodo. The Confessor still retains a confused remembrance of the state of his conscience. If however he confesses to another, there are two opinions: The first opinion affirms that there is an obligation to repeat [the confession], and this is held by Lugo, d. 25, n. 107. Concina p. 434 n. 20.

Croix n. 1295. . 171 n. 243. Sporer p. 243 n. 588. . 4 c. 3 n. 22 et Soto, Molf. etc., Ratio iuxta quam Confessarius non potest 480 Lib. VI. Tract. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. To change penitence, except in a sacramental judgment; but this judgment cannot be exercised except the penitent brings his crimes.

Reason 2. because penance, as taught by Trent, should not only be punitive, but also presumptively medicinal, namely, that it should not merely serve to punish past life, but also to guard future life; and lest the Confessor apply fitting medicine of penance without being able to have knowledge of his sins. The second sentence sufficiently probable denies this obligation, and the Toletans hold [it] 1. 3 c. 11 n. 12. Bonac. qu. 5 p. 3 n. 8. Yes, moreover. Saturation, n. 5. 15. R. 53 with Henry. Victor. Portello.

They consider it probable, Sporer n. 589 et seq., because in this second Confession no judgment is passed upon the sins confessed in the preceding Confession, where the judgment had already been formulated; but rather it deals only with the penitent's inability or weakness to perform the penance, and thus the first reason is answered. It is more difficult to respond to the second objection; but it can be responded to, that the Confessor, by converting penance into an equivalent or lesser one, may

provide medicine for other confessed sins, or by imposing equivalent penance, or by reducing given penance according to the disposition of the penitent. Moreover, the same authors of the first Sentences (as Palaus says, ... They add probatively Sporer I. c. and Doubt 2. Whether a lower Confessor can commute penance imposed by a Superior on account of reserved cases? The first opinion is more common and denies this, and this view is held by Gonet, d. 13, n. 36. Your question concerns whether a lower confessor can commute a penance imposed by a superior for reserved cases? The more common first opinion denies this, and Gonet holds this view in his work, distinction 13, note 36. Suar, distinction 35 section 24, Cap. I.

Dub. VI. On the essence of this Sacrament. 48r. Lugo, Distinction 25', no. 104. Sporer n. 5185. Renzi c. 2 sect. 3 qu. 27 item Vega, c. 10 n. 72. Reason, because an accessory follows the nature of the principal: hence it was fitting that the superior's judgment be reserved in the principal case, namely in absolving reservates, so that the imposition of penance remains reserved for such a judgment.

The second opinion asserts that those who hold this view maintain it on page 21 § last note 7 and 242 cum et cc. with Vasq., namely, that if the penitent again submits to the inferior, this one can form a new judgment concerning them, and thus commute the penance. It does not hinder, as they say, that the inferior does not have power in the sentence of the superior, for when the 'reservation' is removed, both [i.e., the inferior and the superior] have the same power. Nevertheless, the first opinion repels me: for although here and now the inferior can form a new judgment concerning those sins, yet he himself has no faculty of changing the sentence of the superior in a previous judgment: for it is certain that the inferior cannot do anything against the law of the superior. I deem it probable, what they say in the commentary of Suarez, Henry, and Victor. Because then the inferior would lawfully be able to commute penance through the presumed consent of the Superior. Doubt is cast upon it.

Whether the penitentiary can commute penance outside of confession? It is certain that another Confessor cannot outside of Confession change a presumed unjust penance imposed by a superior, as commonly they say Diana p. 2 tract 15 R. 53 ('contra Valer. et Victorell.) 74 and Croix n. 1293 with Lugo, who justly opposes it vo- . 31, 482 Lib. VI. Tract. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, it is improbable.

If however the same Confessor who imposed the penance feels doubt, he should consult Doubt 8. Finally, it is possible to commute penance outside of Confession, but not beyond the same day; Sporer no. 586 with Sot., and

Val. extends this to two days; c. with Hen. ., Aver., I c. allow this even for a longer interval. I think it is more truly said according to the more common opinion, which 17 and . hold with Suarez, Vega, and Reginald. Since it is very advantageous for penitents that they be more easily induced to a greater acceptance of penance and more strongly freed from sins, indicate penances which in the ancient penitential canons were erroneously prescribed for certain crimes, as admonish the Roman Catechism, D. Antoninus, and D. Carolus Borromaeus; hence I deemed it worthwhile to add some principal ones according to the order of the Decalogue, namely: Circ I, Precept 1. He who has departed from faith shall perform penance for ten years. Qui à fudguris et divinationibus servierit, vel quive incantationes diabolicas fecerit, poenitens erit annis septem. 3.

Respiciens furta in astrolabio, poenitens erit annis duobus. 4. Si quis ligaturas, aut fascinationes fecerit, poenitens erit duos anni. 5. He who has consulted magicians, in penance he shall be five years. Circ d II. Precept. 2.

Whoever knowing a lie, for forty days shall live on bread and water, and for seven following years shall repent, and never be without repentance; and never be received in witness, and after this receive Communion. He who shall have committed perjury in the Church shall perform penance for ten years. 3. If anyone defames God, or the Blessed Virgin. If anyone shall blaspheme a virgin or some saint before the doors of the churches, he shall do penance for ten years. Chapter I. Doubt. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. On four hundred and eighty-five Dominical feasts, in manifestly solemn manner, while the solemnities of Masses are being celebrated, let him stand there last among them all, without a stole and sandals, with a girdle about his neck; and for seven preceding Wednesdays before those six days he shall fast on bread and water, not entering the Church at all. On each of those seven days he shall feed three poor men, or two, or one, if he can; otherwise some other penance shall be imposed upon him. Let him who refuses entrance to the Church be forbidden, and may he lack burial at a canonical funeral. He who shall have violated a simple vow, shall repent for three years, Cird III. Precept. 1. He who shall have performed any servile work on the Lord's day or fettered a beast, shall perform penance for three days upon bread and water.

If anyone shall have violated the fasts appointed by the Holy Church, he shall do penance for twenty days on bread and water. He who shall have violated the fast in Quadragesima, for one day he shall do penance seven days. Durante la Quadragesima, si comedit carnes sine inevitabili

necessitate, non communiケン Relay About the fourth. Precept. 1. He who speaks evil against his parents shall mourn for forty days on bread and water.

He who has injured his parents, three years. 3. He who shall have struck, seven years. 4. Si quis contra Episcopum, Pastorem, et patrem suum insurrexerit, in Monasterio omnibus diebus vitæ suæ poenitentiam agat. 5. If anyone shall despise or mock the precepts of the Bishop, or of his Ministers, or of his Parochus, he shall do penance for forty days on bread and water. About five. Precept. 1.

He who shall have killed a priest shall make amends for twelve years. If any one shall have killed his father or mother, his brother or his sister, let him during all the time of his life not receive the body of the Lord, unless by death; abstain from flesh and wine while he lives; and fast on the second, fourth, and sixth day of the week. If any man shall have killed a man, he shall always be outside the door of the Church, and at his death he shall receive Communion. Qui homicidii auctor fuit, ob consilium quod dedit, poenitentiam agebit quadraginta diebus in pane et aqua cum septem sequentibus annis. If any woman spontaneously causes an abortion, she will perform penance for forty-three days on bread and water. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. We three; if unwilling, three Quarantines. 6. He who unwillingly has oppressed his son shall perform penance for forty days on bread and water, vegetables, and legumes: he shall abstain from wife for ten days. Then the penitent shall be three years in legitimate fasts: moreover, he shall observe three fasts of Lent each year. He who through the cause of hiding commits the murder of his son shall do penance for ten years.

Si quis per iram subitam, aut per rixam hominem necariit, poenitentiam aget annos tres. If anyone shall have wounded someone, or shall have cut off some limb from him, he shall do penance for one year through lawful fasts. 10. If anyone shall have struck a blow next day and caused no harm, he shall do penance for three days on bread and water. Sixth Circuit. Precept. 1. If a layman who is free has lived in concubinage with an unrestrained woman, he will be penitent for three years.

He who, negligent in defilement by foul speech and look, will perform penance for twenty days. He who shall have sinned with his wife in an unchaste manner, penitent shall be forty days. 4. He who shall have fornicated with two sisters, or violated a spiritual daughter, shall perform perpetual penance. He who shall have committed incest (not so grievous a

sin) penitent shall be for twelve years. 6. He who shall have violated a monialis, let him do penance for ten years. 7. Si quaedam mulier cerussa vel alium pigmentum sibi oblinit ut aliis viris placet poenitentiam agat annos tres. 8.

Si presbyter cognovit filiam suam spiritualis, quam scilicet baptizavit vel quae sibi confessa fuit, debet poenitentiam agere duodecim annos. And si crimen sit manifestum, debet deponi, et peregrinando decem annos poeniteat, et postea monasterium intret, tota vita sua moraturus ibidem. 9. For adultery, a penance of seven years and ten years is imposed. For an impudent kiss or embrace, thirty days of penance are prescribed. Regarding seven. Precept. 1.

If anyone shall have done an injury to a thing of lesser fortune... he shall perform penance for one year. He who has stolen anything from the goods of the Church, whether a chalice, or ecclesiastical money, or offerings made to the Church, shall do penance for seven years. He who shall have retained the tenth for himself, or shall have neglected to give it, shall do penance for a year. Cap. I. Doubtful V. I. On the essence of this Sacrament. It will restore 485 and bring about penance through days 20 in bread and water. 4.

He who receives usury commits robbery... he will perform penance for three years, one year in bread and water. Octo circuli. Precept. 1. He who shall have given false witness shall be punished with five years of penance. Let him who has given false testimony do penance in bread and water as long as he lives. Si quis facile detraxerit, poeniteus erit dies septem in pane et aqua.

Circumcisione IX. et X. Precept. i. Desiring an alien thing in an evil manner and being greedy, a penitent will be so for three years. 2. If anyone concupiscit to fornicate, if a Bishop, poeni-ting erit anno septem: if a Presbyter, quinque: if a Diaconus or Monachus, tres,... if a Clericus or laicus, annos duos. ## ARTICULUS II. ## DE SATISFACTIONE PER INDULGENTIAS. ## § I. What is an indulgence, and what is required for it?

What is an indulgence? Why is a cause required for obtaining an indulgence? What conditions are required?

See the Resolutions. And notably n. 9. Whether all operations ought to be made to occur in the state of grace? And n. 10. Is it required that a state of grace be present in order to gain an Indulgence for the Dead? And n. 19.

Whether a venial sin unremitted impedes one from gaining an Indulgence for the dead in regard to other remitted matters? « Resp. i. Indulgence is grace by which a certain work, prescribed and conceded by an operation, having been performed, remits the temporal penalty (not however the guilt) outside of sacrament, sacrifice, and martyrdom, through the application of satisfactions of Christ and saints: this either by way of absolution towards the subjects of the Church; or simply by way of solution towards non-subjects, such as the dead and catechumens, to whom it is given. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament. Penitence.

"Proinde tantum dantur indulgentiae per modum suffragii." To sanctify. Book 6, Question 1, Article 1, Page 533, Response 2. An indulgence requires a cause » pious, and reasonable, and such is the common opinion according to the sentiment. The reason is derived from the nature of the dispensation of goods, which without cause effected by a lower authority does not hold, and it is a dissipation. Ita vide Lugdunensis d. 27 n. 139. et Wigandt t.r. 14 n. 91.

But however, a cause ought to be proportionate? Some deny it according to sect. 3 n. 1, but rather affirm it Lugo number 141 with Adr. Cajetanus et communis. » Nor does it hinder D. Thomas in IV, De Duobus Principiis, quaestio 1, articulus 3, questio 2. » whom the adversaries praise for themselves; for there the Holy Doctor does not require equality of works with due punishment of sin, but proportionality with reparation. The same is felt by Bellarmine in "De Indulgence" book 1, chapter 12, volume 2.

But he rightly observed that it is not for subordinates to judge whether a cause is just or not; they should simply consider it to be just. *533* Resp. 3. For obtaining indulgences these conditions are required. I. That he may be baptized. II. That he may be baptized. That it may be under the "granted" conceded.

III. That it may not be bound by major excommunication, as is common; because this deprives one of communion in spiritual goods. IV. That is, it may be in grace at least then when the prescribed work is completed, because the penalty is not remitted before the guilt. * (See below n. 9.) Busemb.) V. That the commanded work may be fulfilled entirely and perfectly.

VI. That the prescribed work be diligently and completely fulfilled at once; for it is sufficient that what is vitiated comes from an dishonest end or from some other wicked circumstance (as they teach), even if nothing.

Cap. I. Dub. IV. On the essence of the Sacrament of Penance. 4.7: "less conduces to the end proposed by the Pontiff, hence it limits." Reason for the posterior limitation; because the reason of the commanded work is the attainment of the end intended by the Pontiff. V. 6 qu. 1 p. 5. (Others distinguish as Mazzotta t. r p. 244. and Bon. d. 6 qu. 1 p. 5 n. 15. commonly, that is to say, if fault or negligence affects the substance of the work, for example, if someone prays or engages in almsgiving out of vain glory, then you do not gain Indulgence, see note 536. h.)

XVIII. Otherwise, if it is not concerning the substance, as when one prays distractedly; thus Mazzotta, loc. cit., against Wigandt, tr. 14, n. 93, what does he deny, if Indulgences are given to God for petitioning, that one who has presumed to enjoy Indulgences, which He has granted, can have the right to use them in Indulgence? » 2. They do not expire by the death of the grantor, since they are [still] valid. gratiae, nec, ut habet Sa, ante notitiam revocatio nis. » 3: Et intelligendae sint ut sonant; cum tamen sint gratiae, largè sunt interpretandae (nisi sint de pœnitentis injunctis, ut ex 20 n. 77.) servatâ tamen verborum pro-prietate.

Wherefore are the perplexities to be understood without temporal restriction if they are without time limitation. » 4. Even though given for the article of death, according to Sa, it expires when once accepted; nevertheless, the contrary is more probable, on account of the reason given. But that does not require the application of 'Confession', or any other ministry. Quintan. in append. t. g'd. 4: Tamen expedit moribundo ad invocationem nominis JESU et MARIA saepius exquirent simulque in memoriam revocare intentionem lucrandi istas In delinquentias ibid. d. 4. For it is probable, if he have several images, rosaries, and beads blessed; to be able either by reason of the same concession, or of different ones, so often to gain merit as the name of JESUS has been repented of, or the required work has been performed.

The penitent may earn several plenary Indulgences by means of multiple: concessions, and simultaneously to gain them, for instance, because they possess various rosaries, or beads, crosses, images; to which are applied such concessions; or the title of their Order, Confraternity, etc., provided that certain works are not required for a special necessity to be fulfilled. Quintan. in append. t. 9 d. 4 hoc autem, etiamsi eas vel earum aliquas ignorent aut non recordentur, ibid. ex Lugo, Diana, et aliis 6 contra Rodrig. It is required that the moribund have a cross, a bead, an image, etc., with him at the hour of death, so that he may profit by reason of it: and indeed, in order that he may more safely and certainly obtain possession thereof, let him have dominion or ownership thereof, and let it be among his effects. Non tamen est necesse, ut colle appensa, brachio

obvoluta, manuve ap- praehensa sint (etsi aliquo horum modorum habere sit tutius), sed sufficit esse in lecto, vel juxta moribunda- mum; licet ipse nec videat, nec tangat, nec sciat, aut recordetur se habere (nisi aliud exprimatur). Sufficiet praesump- tum habere commodata, seu quod usum (praesertim si id in ipsa indulto exprimitur, ut in Caroli Borromaei, et quinque Sanctorum fit.) Neque necesse est retinere donec expiret (etsi et hoc sit tutius), sed sufficit in aliquo mortis articulo habere, in eoque nomen JESU (si hoc requiritur) infu- care. The same is found in the sixth and seventh chapters. Concessions made to the living cannot be applied to the dead, unless it is expressly stated otherwise; because they depend on the will of the one granting them.

It is probable that a concession may be obtained repeatedly for a certain time by repeating the prescribed works, for example on the same day, unless an additional restriction be added because favors are to be amplified. Ita Henrig. Rodrig. Monstrarium, tamen, videtur, probabilius, ob volunt Cap. I. Doubt. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. They will concede the contrary disposition reasonably presupposed. See. Card. de Lugo d. 27 sect. 6. à n. 95. 9. Although it may have been consulted that all works be done in grace: yet this does not seem simply necessary. However, it is incumbent upon confessors and confessions officers that, when indulgences are proclaimed, they incite the people to a later confession.

It is asked whether all works should be done in the state of grace for a plenary indulgence? Others affirm, however, as Bellarm. 1. i de distinguunt: they say that if the indulgence is intended for obtaining God's placation, it should be according to the intention if it is for another purpose, such as satisfying one's debt, aiding the poor, or building a temple. Finally, others more commonly and reasonably say: it suffices that the ultimate work be done in a state of grace, as Concina says, page 450, note 34, with common consent; d. 52, sect. 5, cit. et q. 6, art. 2, n. 6, with Bon. Bosa. And reason, because such works at least dispose towards pleasing God, and have at least some fitness for this purpose. And to this opinion adhered N. P. Benedictus XIV. in his Constitution inter præteritos, where he said: We deemed those not to be excluded from the fruit of indulgence, who begin visitation without previous Confession, provided that they complete the last work in grace when they have occasion to do so. « 10. That a person may profit for the dead, it does not probably require that he be in grace; because he places the work merely as a condition, upon the fulfillment of which the Pontiff applies Indulgence to the deceased, whether it be satisfaction of Christ or of the Saints.

Ita Escob. tom. 7 E. 5 c. 7 n. 45. ex 10 n. 93. However, the contrary is taught by Cardinal de Lugdunensis in Decree 17, note 75, requiring the state of grace, at least at the end of the work: which opinion seems safer to me. * (And this seems more true to me, when Wigandt treats in tract 14, note 96. Reply 3, porque nadie puede aplicar la Indulgencia a otro, a menos que primero se la haya hecho propia. Here however it is to be noted with the same that, although the effect of Indulgences is to be fulfilled for the living. 4th Book. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. bile, non sit tamen infallibilis pro defunctis, cum eis nulla adsit promissio, unde Deus ipsas acceptat tantum ad suum beneplacitum.) 11. The work prescribed while it is being performed should be useful to the end intended by the one who permits it; such as, for example, is the case. » alms prescribed for the redemption of captives, although it be done in or through a sin, provided that another work be enjoined and prescribed in grace (V. Lugo, dist. 27 n. 84, non autem oratio præscrípta ad plácandum Deum, si ipsamet sit peccá tum ex mala circumstántia; uti nec jejunium, si te ine-bries, item nec visitátio Ecclesiarum sine ullá de-votione.

Of churches without any devotion, neither fasting if you are weak, nor item visitation of churches without any devotion. Thus 12. Plures indulgenciæ, quas in uno et eodem opere diversis viis concesserint, possunt lucrifieri si opus sit æquè utile ad finem utriasque indulgentiæ; nec sit iterabile intra idem tempus, uti jejunium vel communio. Thus Prefect. and ... » 13. They do not profit from Indulgences I. Whoever through presumption or ignorance omits either entirely the prescribed work, or its notable preparation; for example, if a boy or an old man does not fast; unless perhaps this work has been changed for him into something else on account of great difficulty. II.

Who performs an act joined to another place, time, or order, than that prescribed; or through another who was the principal cause, as if through another he fasted, and the Churches visited... I. 7 Bonac. 1. cit. III. He who gave alms intended for a servant to be distributed, and withheld them, as Bonac. states from many sources, contrary to St. Augustine. IV. He who omits something which according to the judgment is probable, or even more probably, is not necessary, if nevertheless it be necessary in itself; because a common error does not supply a defect. Thus Bonac.

from this and others. » 14: Non obstat effectui Indulgentiae. I. And it is required that a little something be omitted from the work, for instance, v. gr. » ceremony in sacred matters, or if you eat but little in fasting; because an act is morally considered as whole. II.

If you fulfill a required work through someone else acting as an instrument, e.g., in alms to be given. If you give a small alms, unless it is expressed in the Bull that it should be given for the capacity of some other person: then more must be given by the rich than by another, thus it follows. Great. So, and others. IV. If you cannot enter the church to visit it on account of the multitude of people, let prayer be made before the doors, or in the cemetery.

Goodness. V. Even though in the work performed you have not "had the intention of gaining Indulgences," as Salas, Bonac., and others teach against; at least if you had a permissive intention, "as is stated in Article 6, Number 4." Cross n. 1325. with Lugo, Molina. » Poll.) * VI. Even though the works were otherwise due, e.g., from an ecclesiastical precept.

Thus » » 15. When power is given to commute works prescribed in one place to another, this does not necessarily occur in confession and from the confessor who hears the penitent; but it can be done outside and by another competent person. Therefore it is declared 7 c. 10 n. 8. and Præpos. qu. 14 d. 10 n. 88. 16. It is more probable that he who performs merely a part of the work prescribed will not be rewarded with a part of the indulgence, unless so little is lacking that it may be considered morally whole. Thus.

When it is prescribed that certain altars be visited, it suffices to turn oneself to those by praying at that same place, as Sa 18 has. When the Confession is prescribed, unless it is expressed in the Bull, it is more probable that venial sins are not required as a necessary condition, but rather as a disposition to the state of grace. Bon. 1. c. 19. No one attains full Indulgence § 39 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. "Assumed, however, all sins, except with all guilt, a venal liberty, when the last work is fulfilled." » Wherefore it is fitting that communion be last. » V. Laym: » It is certain that a venial sin, if not remitted as regards its debt, cannot be remitted as regards its punishment.

Therefore, St. Thomas in Sup., q. 27, art. 1, those that follow, art. 6, n. 2. Sporer pg: 234 n. 8. et alii passim. That venial sin, however, does not hinder the remission of the due punishment for other sins already forgiven, so that the debt may be paid in regard to them. cc. ac Wigandt tr. 14 n. 94. et Renzi c. 2 sect. 4 q. 17. cum . It does not hinder that plenary Indulgence had been granted under the reason of total remission, so that if the penalty

of that unremitted venial is not removed, then no penalty will be removed. For it is answered that, congruity does not repugn to the remission of some other person's venial fault, so that the faults of others be remitted together with the punishment; but the Pontiff, in granting a plenary Indulgence, is not presumed to intend to restrict it only to those to whom all venial faults are remitted, but rather to grant it according to the capacity of the subject, so that at least the punishment of venial faults be remitted whose fault has been remitted. Here it must be noted that for Indulgences to be gained, a presumed confession of venial sins is required; if in the diploma it is read: He who is truly penitent, confessed, etc., according to Decree 8.

C. Indulg. approbato à Clemente. XIII. what was commanded to be published on March 19, 1759. He declared, however, that even during the vigil of the feast the Confession can still be fulfilled. Thus it is reported by P. Ferraris Bibl. t. 8 Append. n. 4. §. II. Quadruple Indulgence, et quomodo differat a Jubileo. Vide quae habentur apud Busembach. Annotantur sancta à Bened. XIV. concerning the Jubilee. 537 Qu.

All works for the purpose of gaining jubilee should be completed in one week? What? II. By the Confession according to Chapter I. Doubt. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. If a reservation of censures and penalties is not removed, may it be invalid in the Jubilee? Qu. III. He sins gravely who, having been absolved from reserved cases, later commits another sin by not fulfilling other works? What. IV.

An he who has confessed in the Jubilee and has forgotten the reserved sin may subsequently be absolved by anyone? And can a change in vows be obtained? Yes. V. Having a contrite heart for leading the Jubilee, let him remain absolved from reserved oblations, if later it does not prove profitable? What.

VI. Can one be absolved who has committed a reserved sin in the confidence of the Jubilee? What VIII. May one be absolved before satisfaction of the part, or the oath thereof? What. VIII. By which excommunications and censures can be absolved in the Jubilee?

Dub. 1. Can those who are publicly excommunicated be absolved? Dub. 2. Can it be dispensed with in irregularity? 538 IX. Who come in the name of the sick, of captives, and of travelers? What. Who come in the name of infirm, captives, and travelers?

Is it sufficient for the Jubilee to be profitable that mental prayer be said, or

a slight one saying 'non peccare', because, just as vocal prayer is such that it suffices to be externally pronounced? Qu. XI. Does an adequate mental prayer or a slight utterance suffice to avoid sin for the Jubilee year, since, just as vocal prayer suffices, it must be uttered externally? A small alms? What. Twelfth. Whether it satisfies for the fasting imposed in childhood, fulfilling other fasts that are due?

Res. 1. Another indulgence is total, that is to say full, abundant, and most full, which not only removes the penance imposed by the Confessor, or Canons, or one imposed according to them as due, but also abolishes every presumed penalty of Purgatory. It does not differ from Jubilaeum except accidentally by certain Privileges, as in Jubilaeum a dispensation is licit in certain vows, absolution from reserved censures and penalties, and that any approved Confessarius may be elected. V. Therefore, v. In- » indulgent.

Good. D. 6 Q. 1 P. 2. An indulgence is partial, such as that of one, or even a few years; also seven years, forty years, shipwrecked years, etc. Likewise a third part of sins, by which is not signified to take away so much duration of Purgatory, but so much penalty to be remitted, as would be removed through fasting for one year, or a few years, or forty days on bread and water; according to the Canons formerly accustomed to impose. But when plenary Indulgences are added with some years, or remission of a third part of sins, this is according to reversed sentences, or by granting diverse referenda; or it is done for caution, so that if perchance the cause of the Indulgence was not sufficient, at least they may be valid for those years to be gained, or so that the addition may be granted for another time, action, and place; or finally, so that they may be applied to others through the means of suffrage. V. Resp. 2. About the Jubilee, notable following sequence. 1.

During the year of jubilee, it is customary to suspend all full indulgences, both for those who are outside the city and for all others, so long as they are alive, even in prisons (except, however, those who are in danger of death, as Bonaventure teaches in his sixth dissertation, question one, number two, according to the declaration of the Urban). VIII. facta anno MDCLXXV neque quoad defunctos); itemque aliae facultates, v.g. absolvendi a casibus Bullæ Cænæ, commutandi vota, dispensandi etc., concessæ in ordine ad lucrandas plenarias Indulgentias. Particular indulgences granted to individuals, or by another besides the Pope, nor privileges of religious are suspended; for instance, absolutions from reserved cases, etc., because faculties granted in order to grant indulgences alone are suspended. Thus » . eto. apud Diana t. 1 t. de Bulla Cruci, c. VIII. anno 1625. Similarly, neither is the conceded faculty suspended to Bishops by v. Holy Year, § 4.

Quintan, in 16. 2. Even though what it teaches is probable; yet the contrary is more true; » as Congr. 6 q. 1 p. 5 n. 32 affirms who nevertheless states, » that in a Holy Year it can be obtained so many times as the prescribed works are performed: this being evident from the declaration of Urban VIII. Chap. I. Dub. Four.

On the essence of this Sacrament. 495 » 3. To satisfy then, i.e., he who confesses on the Sabbath before the first Sunday, as it is stated in the item that speaks about confession and communion at the last Sunday closing the Jubilee. However, other works ought to be done first, and indeed within one week, teaches Lugo on the 27th day, note 105 against 2. He who did not observe the order within the prescribed works. 3. Si quis intra illud tempus ceperit confessionem, quam materialiter imperfectam oporteat differri longius, potest tunc absolvi a reservatis, et commutari vota: postea vero extra tempus Jubilei absolvi ab omnibus, praesumptum quae oblitus est reservatis, ac in oblitis praesumptum dispensari: imo potest postea omnia facere Confessor finita confessione, qua ante, quia coepta causa, manet potestas delegati, donec finiatur. Thus Sa, 2 c. 40 d. 16.

Good. I. 4 c. 54. » 4. He who neglected to earn during the Jubilee in his homeland can earn elsewhere while it lasts. But presumptuously in his own country, if at the time of publication he did not have knowledge of it through invincible ignorance. c. 5. When two immediate days occur such that two Jubilees are present, each of which requires Confession and Communion, there is no need to confess and communicate twice, provided one perseveres in grace; nevertheless, other works must be repeated. 32 d. 64. See Diana p. 4 t. 4.

R. 166. "Above all, it is pertinent to note what has been sanctioned by HH." Page 536 Bened. XIV. In sua Constitutione, inter praeteritos, edita 3 Decemb. 1749 pro Jubileo Anni Sancti (de qua praecedenter locutus in Allo- cutidne Consistoriali habita die 5 Maji eod. an. (vide in) hic dicit: Difficultates circa facultatem Jubilaei in unum congerere, et questiones omnes de medio tollere non praetermitemus. Adding there: Idea Doctors Constitutiones aliorum Pontificem falsa interpraedisc, quia non bene verba ipsarum perpenderunt. Then in the aforementioned Constitution.

Among the aforementioned, it is civil. ## 496 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. 1. By the words, truly penitent and confessed, it should be understood the actual second [penance].

All visits to churches, hearing of Masses, entering into any congregation where works of piety are exercised, and similar things. The perfection of churches is not achieved in a day, beginning the day from midday to midnight, or from evening to evening § 13. III. By the clause. According to our pleasure and that of the Apostolic See, the Indulgences do not cease with the death of the Pontiff: if only it be said according to our pleasure § 18. IV.

Near the suspension of Indulgences, whenever in the Indulgence it is said, all and each, even penances should be suspended. § 22. V. Indulgences for the living ought not to be applied to the dead. § 23. VI. During the time of the Jubilee Year of the Holy Year, remain suspended the faculties of Regulars absolving from cases according to the Bull of Cæna, and reserved to the Apostolic See, and those for commutation of vows, whether they have been granted with a view to indulgences, or for other reasons. § 26 et 32. VII.

During the Year of Jubilee, no one may be absolved from external heresy. § 38 VIII. When it is said: Let the exchange of vows be dispensed with, principal attention should be given to the exchange itself, so that the substituted matter is not excessively diminished; but if it is said: Let dispensation be made by exchanging, § 45. IX. The faculty of dispensing does not include the faculty of commutation. § 47. X. Facultas dispensandi non includitur in facultate commutandi. Concerning irregularities, whatever there is in controversy, whether an irregularity derived from a sin be comprehended under the name of censure or not, permission to dispense is given from hidden irregularity on account of the violation of censures only. § 50.

XI. Facultas commutandi pia opera non intelligitur data circa confessionem et communionem (praeterquam cum puéris), aut orationem necessariam in uti nec jejunium si te inebries, item nec visitatio ecclesiarum sineulla devotione.- ne. Nor can a commutation be made for works otherwise due. Nec Jubileum acquiri potest per opus aliàs de- bitum (puta si quis ex legato teneatur darè eleëmosy- nam pauperi), nisi quod Indulgentiam concedit nominetim dicat, quod per prædictum opus acquiri possit; id enim sæpè contingit, cum inter injuncta opera trium dierum jejunium præscribitur, dies no- minatim indicando, ex. g. dicitur, quod esse debeant tres dies. quatuor. temporum Septembris. § 53. Item Chapter One. Dub. IV.

On the essence of this Sacrament. The commutation should occur in an operation of the same nature. § 55. XII. Besides major excommunication, which is reserved to the greater Pontiff in the Constitution. Of the office of an apostle, if a priest accomplice in a vile sin imposes penance upon a

penitent who is outside the article of death 'Confessionem excipit poenitentis, eumque absolvit; vel qui in articulo mortis absolvit, cum alius Sacerdos non desit; sive, cum alius sit Sacerdos, sibi fingit, quod si poenitens illi confiteatur, infamia aut scandalum inde oriturum sit, et ideo Confessio- nem ejus excipit, aut absolvit: imponitur hic inhabi- litas in quocumque Jubileo absolvendi complicem poenitentem. § 59 et 60. XIII. Since all those things that are attributed to the attainment of a Jubilee are directly and as it were its own preparation, it clearly follows that there is no place for the use thereof except with him who is both prepared to attain the Jubilee and has a certain purpose of fulfilling the works imposed. § 62.

XIV. Confessors can absolve only in the sacramental forum and in designated churches, and they can commute vows. § 63. XV. During the Year of Jubilee, or in any case of Indulgences, penance must be imposed by the Confessor, so that the Sacrament may not remain defective. § 65. XVI. The name of the party injured is not understood by the judge, but by him who has suffered the damage. § 66.

And likewise it is declared that vows cannot be commuted to the prejudice of a third party; however, a vow of perseverance in some congregation is deemed congruent, which assumes the nature of a contract and mutual obligation between the vow-maker and the congregation. XVII. If anyone after Confession shall lapse into a mortal sin, he ought to confess again, that the last work may be done in grace. § 73. XXIII. Works accomplished in sin are valid for gaining the Jubilee, provided they be done with a mind to render honor to God; not from a vain motive, and thus let the last work be fulfilled in grace. § 75 et 76. XIX.

By the name of the Inhabitant [of Rome], come all who are in Rome, with intent to remain there for the greater part of the year, and all who are in Rome on account of some office or business. Confession is necessary to gain the Jubilee, even if one has merely venial sins. § 77. The confession is necessary for gaining the Jubilee, even if one has only venial sins. § 77. For other Indulgences, if Confessio, Tom, V. 498 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Reproof is prescribed for disposition, but venial sins do not require Confession; otherwise, if it is joined as a prescribed work. § 78. XXI. If anyone after Confession falls into mortal sin, although he is not bound to repeat visits to churches, to hear Masses, to enter into some congregation where works of piety are practiced, and similar things, he is nevertheless bound again to confess. § 79. XXII. It is not necessary to enter or exit through the Holy Doors in visiting the basilicas in order to obtain indulgence, although such an

entrance is required for the work of supererogation. § 81.

XXIII. If anyone before the publication of the Indulgence visited the basilicas and completed the visitation on that same day of publication, he may rejoice in the Jubilee, provided he perform another visitation of four basilicas entirely that same day. Basilicas et complet visitationes Ecclesiarum, auditionem Missarum, ingressum in aliquam Congregationem, ubi pietatis opera exercentur, et similia, ipsa die publicationis potest gaudere Jubilæo, modo aliam visitationem quatuor Basilicarum totam illo die perficiat. § 83. XXIV. Sufficit oratio dicit: hunc non peccare, quia ut oratio sit vocalis sufficit ut exterius proferatur; qui autem solacium orare voluerit laudandus est, aliquam tamen et alii dicunt hoc peccare mortaliter, quia verba quae non audiunt vocalem orationem non constituunt. Oratio adjungat. § 83. XXV.

One can again work at the Jubilee if he repeats the commanded works; but only on the first occasion can one rejoice in the faculties. § 84. This however is not to be understood with regard to gaining Indulgence granted to those who have visited the Church on prescribed days; then only once can the Indulgence be acquired, as stated there, only once can the Indulgence be acquired, as stated there. XXV. In concessione facultatis absolvendi a censuris Bullae Cœnæ non includitur facultas absolvendi ab haeresi externa. § 85 XXVII. Qui, facta confessione, est absolutus a censuris et alias gratias votorum recepit, si mutat propositum implendi reliqua, manet dispensatus a votis, nec reincidit in censuras. § 86. This addition, which is in the Constitution. He who on the day declared that he would celebrate, having previously received the granted faculty from Moniales and their novices in the Constitution, retains the dispensation from vows, nor does he fall again into censures. § 86.

Benedictus Deus (in anno 1750 § 4 eligendi sibi tempore Jubilaei quemcumque Confessarium intelligendam esse de quolibet Confessario approbatum ab Ordinario loci pro quocumque Monasterio loci illius. Here it is to be noted that during the Jubilee time Regulars may fulfill Confession with any Priest approved by the Ordinary, even a secular one, as declared in Chapter I. Dub. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. 499 and in the Constitution. Only-Begotten.

Ita refert P. Ferrar. Library v. Approval art. 2 no. 21. They can also be absolved from that supposed case in their Order's reserved cases. It is asked I. Is it necessary that all works be completed in one week for the purpose of gaining the Jubilee?

To respond, it is first necessary to note the usual words appended to such Indults, which are: Those who have interfered with processions, or designated Churches, those who have cleansed them from interference in processions, or designated Churches, and those who on the fourth, sixth, and alternate Saturday of two weeks have fasted, and together confessed their own sins, and SS., and on the fourth, sixth, and alternate Saturday of two weeks have fasted, and together confessed their own sins, and SS. Having received Communion and having given alms, etc. Given this, negatively they respond to the inquiry. 24 p. 12 § 3 n. 19. 6 q. 1 p. 5 n. 34. item Præpos. et Naldo apud Renzi cap. 2 sect. 5 q. 1 and it agrees if there be a cause. Reason, because when it is said in the indult that the works to be performed are to be done in another of the two weeks, it does not follow that the completion should be restricted to one week. The second opinion, to which I adhere and affirm, holds this: and they maintain it. 4 c. 4 n. 28. Lugo d. 27 n. 105. (qui contrariam falsam vocat) Sporer suppl. p. 263 n. 173. et Fausto, Gobat et aliis passim ut asserit Renzi l. cit. cum Nunno, ex Sanctorell. Reason, because this is the common practice of faithful men, it confesses presumptuously.

And I likewise think it should be said concerning Confession and Communion with Lugo, first of the judgments, which say that he who had performed the prescribed works in the first week could nevertheless be absolved in the second by those reserved. But the opposite appears more true according to the words added in the Indulgence, namely that he should confess his own sins, etc., therefore fasting ought to be fulfilled for 500 libras. VI. Draw. IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: within a week, so too Confession and Communion at the same time.

It does not hinder to say with Palaeo that this likewise entails an obligation of works, not of time; for truly a particle likewise imports the annexation of works, not only as regards their substance, but also as regards the supposed circumstance of time. - Probabilissime however Lugo n. 107 v. I admonish, Bonac. et al., that if anyone has fulfilled other works in the first week, he can conveniently complete the Communion on the Lord's Day immediately thereafter according to common custom. And similarly regarding Confession, Diana p. i tract. 1 n. 107. with Soto, Reg., and others commonly say that this was once presumed to have been declared by Gregory XIII. From which follows (as well he notes bene). It is asked II. Whether by means of an invalid Confession in the Jubilee one is absolved from reserved censures and the reservation of sins is removed?

If Confession has been culpably nullified (whatever they may say), it must be altogether denied with Lugo on the 20th day [of the month], n. 113, and in article 11, n. 2. (who justly denies this against Lugo, even if

someone had the intention later to make a valid confession after that). The reason is, first of all, because no one's fraud should be countenanced; secondly, because faculties are conceded in Confession so that through it the faithful may gain Jubilee indulgences; hence he who sacrilegiously confesses, although he really does not wish to gain Jubilee indulgence through such a confession, cannot enjoy those faculties. And concerning this, it does not seem that there is further room for doubt after the declaration of N. P. Benedict. XIV. ut supra notavimus n. 536. infra numero. XIII. If however the Confession was without any defect of sorrow and was made with good faith, the same is held by Bonac. d. 5 q. 7 p. 5 § 5 n. 9 cum cum Cap. I. Doubt.

IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. A penitent, indeed, because the faculty of absolution has been granted under the condition of earning the Jubilee, which certainly cannot be acquired through invalid Confession. Others, however, hold that through such Confession no reservation is inappropriately removed; thus Lugo, Distinction 20, n. 110. c. according to the Council. Croix l. c. qui n. 1475. esteit hoc probabile putatus. Reason, because, as they commonly say (though speaking outside the time of the Jubilee), himself Bonac. I c. 23 p. 15 § 6 et cum aliis passim, peccata reservantur ut in confessione deferantur habenti jurisdictionem in illa, sive ordinario, sive delegato, utque ipse judicet imponendo poenitentiam et absolutionem ferendo: quod jam fit in casu nostro; unde ad hoc ut confessor possit reservationem auferre, sufficit ut poenitens habeat verum animum lucrandi jubileum. But notwithstanding this, the first opinion seems more probable to me, because, although the Pontiff grants the faculty of absolving from reserved cases so that faithfuls may profit by the Jubilee, it is not presumed to grant this to those who cannot profit by the Jubilee through Confession.

And it seems confirmed by the words of Blessed [individual or title]. XIV. in the aforementioned Constitution. Among the precepts, where it says that faculties are granted as preparations for the attainment of the Jubilee; therefore, it is not presumed that he will avail himself of those faculties who is not a preparation to gain from the Jubilee. It is asked thirdly. Whether he sins gravely who, after having been absolved from reserved cases, subsequently does not fulfill the works imposed? The opinion of Puma affirms what is held in question 11, article 4, note 2, when he says this regarding that sentence, which the Blessed One also states.

XIV. in the aforementioned Constitution. Among the past ones. § 86 fullness to be subsistent in reason, because in a serious matter he counteracted that intention of the Pontiff who granted faculties as a medium for Jubilee profit. But they commonly deny 4 c. 44 n. 53. with

Henriq. 24 p. 12 § 3 n. 13. 7 part. 5 § 1 n. 18. Lugo distinction 20 article 100. Sporer p. 209 n. 215. et 5os Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament. Penitence. c. 13 n. 57. cum Naldo, Diana, et in dubio de praecepto, nemo ad illud tenetur. Commonly however they say. Laymen, contra Ugolin, consider such a penitent who neglects to fulfill works as scarcely liable to reservation or censure.

This has been defined by the same Blessed one. XIV. in the Decree [or Constitution] § 86. It is asked IV. An homo, qui postulavit confessus sit tempore Jubilaei, et obliviscens se confiteri peccata reservata, aut ex causa illa omisit, possit deinde a quocumque Confessario ab eis absolvi? All affirm that if during the Year of Jubilee the Confessor had an expressed intention of absolving a presumed reserved case. Si vero hanc non habuerit, negant cum Vasq. et Sylv.

Rosel. ac Sayr. apud l. 8 dist. 15 n. 17. cum Sa, et Henr. 24 p. 12 § 3 n. 9. But Busem. more probabily affirm as stated above, in dist. 31 sect. 4 n. 24 and . 11 art. 4 n. 2. cum Reg. Nave. Cum Aversa, peccata illa oblita tuntur; ita indirecte tollitur reservatio. All nevertheless agree that if anyone has begun Confession within Jubilee, he may thereafter be absolved from all reserved cases. Thus with the Marsh. Henry.

But he who has confessed during the time of the Jubilee, Chapter I. Dub. IV. Concerning the essence of this Sacrament: whether afterwards anyone from any Confessional might obtain a change of vows? They deny both Ratio and Negant, because absolution accomplished through the virtue of the Jubilee could not encompass vows whose commutation was then not sought. But more commonly they affirm. 2 c. 40 n. 109.

Sporer p. 272 nu. 237 cum Gob. Portel. et Sanctorell., idemque tenet, c. n. 18: etiamsi poenitens tempore Jubilæi memor fuerit sui voti. Reason, because (as stated), a penitent, by virtue of Jubilee year, having gained the right to such a commutation after having made profit. Both opinions are probable. However rightly they observe [Rectè autem advertunt], 6 c. 19 n. 10; and it is asked [Quæritur V.]. If a penitent has been confessed at the time of the Jubilee with the intention of gaining some profit, and later does not make any profit, so that he does not fulfill what is required, then is the reservation taken away for those things that are forgotten?

It denies the Council on page 574, note 17, with Vasquez, and it considers probable section 31, article 4, note 23. Reason, because privileges are granted for making profit during the Jubilee, and therefore until that is

achieved, a penitent cannot enjoy them. But more probably they affirm 4 c. 54 n. 45 et de Matr. l. 8 d. 25 num. 21 cum Undè cum Confessarius absolutionem impertitur, tunc reservatio absolutè aufertur, non verò dependenter ab even-tu futuro: nam in Jubiliæo nihil conceditur sub conditione futuri eventùs, et ideò, cum ablatio reservationis jam sortita fuerit effectum suum, poenitens non reincidit in eam, si postea opera non compleat. It is asked VI. Whether one who has committed a sin with the hope of obtaining absolution according to Jubilaeum can be absolved by those under reservation? The first opinion very probably denies this, and § 3 n. 15 because it is not presumed that the Pontiff wishes to favor iniquity.

This is confirmed by that from Trent, s. 24 de Secunda. However, the second sentiment is more common and sufficiently probable, affirming it, which Suarez holds in lib. 4 de voto cap. 54 num. 18 et Palaus loc. cit. num. 16 cum Henri-quæz, Graff. Vega, Nec obstat dicere, quod Pontifex sic foveret iniquitatem: nam, si hoc esset, Christus Sacramentum Pœniti-entiæ instituens adhuc diceretur iniquitatem fovisse; non autem dici debent fovere iniquitatem remedia, quæ à Superioribus peccantibus præparantur. It is asked VII. Whether, by virtue of the faculty granted in Jubilaeos for absolving from secret censures incurred through damage inflicted upon someone, under the condition that penitents not be absolved unless the part is fulfilled, or at least a substitute promise of satisfaction is made, can there be given absolution before satisfaction, or the promise? If the penitent can immediately satisfy, he should be absolved otherwise illicitly and invalidly; thus 7 from Sporer p 209 n. 214 et 10 art. 2 n. 9 with Vasquez, against Sed, for it seems to me that the opinion of Suarés and others as stated above is more correct, because that is the true condition which not being fulfilled, the faculty is not conceded. He says however F.

Theodor. à Spir S. c. 9 § 4 n. 3 sufficiere ad absolvendum satisfactionem fidejussoriam aut juratoriam semper ac Confessarius judicet quod absolutio sit profutura pœnitenti nec eum retardatura à satisfaciendo. But this opinion is more speculative than practical: hence it is rather to be said according to Croix n. 1453 and art. 10 n. 9, that in no case can absolution from censures be denied, unless really the Chapter I. Dub. IV. Let the essence of this Sacrament be preceded by satisfaction: this is expressly stated by Benedict. XIV. in Constitutions.

When called upon (in 27), it is stated: From secret censures due to a part of the laity having incurred (by the Confessor) they shall not absolve the penitent until that party injured has satisfied; or if the penitent cannot satisfy before, they shall not absolve him unless he swear that he will satisfy when he first can. However rightly they say Croix 1. c. et 3 cum. Boss and others rightly consider that satisfaction is to be esteemed as

properly fulfilled for the injured party, if the penitent is absolved in such a manner that the satisfaction is certainly to be morally fulfilled; namely, when the penitent delivers it to the Confessor or deposits it with another who is entitled to receive it. And the same [author] says. Before he satisfies the Fiscal or the Judge, it is permissible for him to receive absolution so that satisfaction may be morally fulfilled: as when the penitent confesses to the Confessor or departs what he owes to another. According to Croix, ibid. If however the penitent is unable to satisfy, then he can be validly and licitly absolved with a more certain and common opinion than that held by Sporer p. 269 n. 214.

F. 24. cum cum . ibid., qui dicebant, non esse absolvendum, qui satisfacere non potest, cum satisfactio sit conditio sine qua non.) Ratio nostrae sententiae est, quia non praesumitur Pontifex impossibilem conditionem postulare. They do not then require a fiduciary bond, or a pledge, or a vow, as Sporer says ibid., lib. 6, because (as they say, ut ajunt). But according to the words of the Pontiff simply reported, then absolutely at least the oath concerning the satisfaction to be performed must be demanded, since it is commanded to Confessors: "They shall not absolve him unless he swears that he will satisfy." Indeed rightly do they say: one who is condemned may properly be absolved. I. Tunc vero recte dicitur: subdito damnante possit absolvi. If the injured party accepts satisfaction, or if that satisfaction is remitted, even though damage has occurred, it is licit.

VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. public, as the Gloss says in chapter Quamvis de pace-in 6. Hence, if anyone strikes a cleric, it suffices for him that he submit himself, or that he forgive the injury inflicted, or behave in such a manner as to prudently presume that all offense has been remitted. However truly Croix n. 1456 advertit cum Bonac. et Fill. (contra.

Tamb, Dian etc.) non sufficere remissionem Monachi offensi, si injuria in totam redundaverit communitatem: et hanc testatur Fillucius esse praxim S. Poenitentiariæ. II. If a part refuses the just satisfaction offered, then the whole does not stand; thus the aforementioned Author says in loc. cit. to Candidus. III. If the penitent offers a part thereof as much as he can, and is reluctant or makes a vow concerning the remainder. IV.

If the debtor cannot then make satisfaction unless with great damage or inconvenience, the same damage that has been suffered by the part damaged would be endured from the delay. Thus the same Author with Navarre and Avila adds, that if the creditor is distant, the debtor can be absolved if he deposits the money in a safe place. Whether, however, one

who is absolved from censures on condition of satisfying, relapses into sin if later he does not satisfy? Asserting and Vega according to 7. But they more probably deny it, Sporer l.c. and . It is questioned VIII.

In quibus casibus et censuris possint Confessores absolvere tempore Jubilaei? They commonly say: 7. de Holzmann p. 163 n. 638. Sporer p. 268 n. 212. . 11 art. 2 n. 1. item Vasq. . In Jubiliæo, quando conceditur facultas absolvendi a reservatis Pontifici, dari praesumptam facultatem absolvendi a reservatis Episcopo, quámvis id non exprimatur. Moreover, although heretics cannot be absolved, they can nevertheless be absolved if they bring forth heretical blasphemies, and if they are supporters or receivers of heretics: likewise readers, retainers, or printers of heretical books; thus Croix n. 1451 with Lugo, and 11 art. 1 n. 6 with contra, and others. Reason, because of such Chapter I. Dub.

VI. On the essence of this Sacrament. 507. crimes, although they are relevant, are nevertheless not properly heresy in form. But there is doubt whether public penitents and clerics, as well as others specifically excommunicated or suspended, can be absolved? They commonly affirm Sporer p. 268 n. 213. 11 art. i n. 5 et Croix n. 1457. cum . Yes, Said. Lay.

Diana, Ratio, quia cum Indultum non distinguat inter publicas et occultas censuras, non est restringenda facultas ad sola occulta. That very thing was expressly conceded by His Holiness. Pius Bened XIV. in Constitutione. Having been convened for five Jubilee years, he said: it is possible to absolve penitents from censures that are publicly remitted in those parts, even though reserved to the Apostolic See; and although withdrawn or specifically declared and notified in those same parts by the local ordinaries or others, censures imposed by any man or judge of those parts may be remitted for the effect only of obtaining Indulgences of this Jubilee. And it is prohibited for confessors to give any testimony regarding absolution from such censures during that time. It is doubted whether dispensations can be granted in irregularities during the time of the Jubilee? Banis affirmant, et Salas. Et Soto quattuor consentiunt. D. 22 q. 3 cum Med. quoad irregularitates ex delicto, quia tales irregularitates habent rationem censurae.

But they commonly deny. D. i sect. 3 Mol. d. 8o. c. n. 2 cum Fill. 351. Moreover, Bened. XIV. concerning the aforementioned, Question IX asks. Who come in the name of the infirm, captives, and travelers, for whom the way of Jubilee may be made broad. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance, is there any change

made in some of the works imposed? It is said that confession and communion are never to be commuted, as commonly say the Doctors of the Church in Lucca 27 n. 118; and it is certain from the mentioned names of informers that all invalids come who cannot perform those works without notable detriment or difficulty. And such are reputed to be presumptuous old men, thus 2. Captivi autem dicuntur, qui contra propriae voluntatem alicubi detinentur; his conceditur commutatio vel prorogatio operum ad lucrandum Jubileum; Holzrn. et ce. Finally, works imposed are prorogued for travelers until their return; and one is not bound to delay his own journey (understand, if he cannot conveniently delay it); thus Holzrn. ibid., when he says that presumptuous Lugo d. 27 n. 126 states that, if someone arrives at a place where the Jubilee is proclaimed during his journey, he may there begin works and continue them on the way.

It is asked X. Whether mental prayer suffices for the works imposed on account of the jubilee is queried. X asks whether a mental prayer sufficed to fulfill the prayers imposed in the jubilee and says: this one did not sin because, since vocal prayer suffices, it is enough that it be externally pronounced; a moderate opinion is held among Croix n. 1421. And Sed probably say that mental prayer suffices Mazzota t. 1 p. 244 et 8 art. 5 n. 7. and Lugo d. 27 n. 111 considers it probable because mental prayer is true prayer; although the Church cannot command mere internal acts, she can nevertheless impose them as a means to earn through the jubilee. Whether, however, a modicum of prayer suffices when one says, "This sin I do not commit," because, in order for it to be vocal prayer, it is sufficient that it be externally pronounced? They affirm this, section 52, chapter 8, note 9, and Mazzotta ibid., with Fill. Item Boss. Diana, and Sed probabilius Concin l.c., ac Holzrn., et alii dicunt, requiri aliquam orationem, nempe quinque Pater et Ave, ut ait Mazzotta: vel sex cum Credo et Gloria, ut dicit Sporer a. 174; vel septem Patres Cap. I.

Doubt. IV. On the essence of this Sacrament. 5th part and Ave, listen moreover to what N. P. Benedict XIV has added above these matters; in the published Constitution §83 he says thus: Although a brief prayer with the sense of fervent piety may suffice for satisfaction, yet generally speaking briefness of prayer is wont to result from little study of piety. We therefore declared this to have been committed mortally, because words which are not heard do not constitute a vocal prayer. A prayer devoutly used with intent to achieve jubilee is sufficient, and praiseworthy is he who prays with mind and spirit, provided that we therefore declare that a vocal prayer devoutly used with intent to achieve jubilee is sufficient, and praiseworthy is he who prays with mind and spirit, provided that some vocal prayers are added to it. Whereupon it seems that the Pontiff admits,

when mental prayer is made, that sufficiency is achieved by adding vocal prayer; and some say that this constitutes mortal sin, because words which are not heard do not constitute vocal prayer, although this in itself is not notable. This however must be noted, which many grave Fathers teach namely, that for the obtaining of Indulgence through the visitation of the Church it suffices to pray vocally either before the door or in the cemetery; if you are unable to enter on account of the multitude of people: so 1 p. 5 n. 26 thus.

Question. XI. Is it enjoined to give any sum as alms during the Jubilee? In hoc præcipuē attendenda sunt verba Indulti; nam si in eo dicatur: Quantùm pro sua cuique facultate visum fuerit; tunc quantitas oportet proportionetur cujusque facultati-bus, unde sufficiens pauperi dare obolum non diviti. Si vero dicitur: Prodi unicuique suggeret devotio, vel quantùm quisque pro arbitrio judicaverit, tunc Sed F. Theodor. à Spir.

S. de Si tandem dicitur simpliciter: Qui dederit eleē- mosynam, distinguendum, si Papa eam postulet tan- tùm ad exercendam misericordiam in pauperes, tunc sufficit (ut dicit præfatus Auctor cum ; secùs si eleē- mosyna exposcitur in subsidium alicujus operæ piæ; idem Auctor cum Passer. ex . qu. 25 art. 2 ad 3, ubi expressè id docet. 510 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It is doubted here whether the poor are bound to make alms during the Jubilee while they are still under obligation to do so?

They deny it, and Article 4 denies it. But more probably the same Author affirms this, and [he] 8 art. 6 n. 2 with Bossuet as Lugo dist. 27 n. 115; c et Sporer p. 264 n. 280. If the superior does not wish to give, they say but rather he considers it more fitting. Doubt. 2. Whether the Jubilee Year, which brings about the distribution of alms to be given out, should be considered profitable if subsequently it is not distributed, or if it is distributed after the time of the Jubilee? They deny [the proposition] Lugdunum, distinzione 27, nota 112.

Sporer n. 180 et 8 art. 6 n. 3 cum Bon. Heart. But affirming Sa v. Indulgence, and Vega, Lezana, and concede likewise Lugo n. 113. and Sporer n. 181., that one who gives alms to a fictitious poor man is not defrauded by Indulgence. Question. Twelfth.

Whether the Jubilee may satisfy for those fasts which are prescribed elsewhere as due from a vow? Sporer affirms, p. 264 n. 168, and Lugo, d. 27 n. 110, with the common opinion, as he asserts (but not without merit, as we shall see soon); because the same work can satisfy two precepts. But

commonly they deny it. Sylv. v. Indulgence, q. 6. Table, Question 10, Article 1, Number 2.

F. qu. 41. Reason, because in a single solution it cannot suffice for two onerous debts, namely, the work, or some condition annexed to the Indulgence. And thus today it must be held according to the words from N. P. Ben. XIV. in V. above no. 536 below no. XI. ## END OF THE FIFTH BOOK. INDEX OF THE TREATISES AND CHAPTERS OF BOOK FIVE. BOOK VI.

TREATISE III. — On the Eucharist. Headings. Pages. 1 On the essence of the Eucharist..... 3 2 On the causes and subject of the Eucharist..... 46 3 On the Eucharist as a sacrifice..... 143 TRACTATUS IV. — On the Sacrament of Potency. 1 On the essence of this Sacrament..... 311
MONITUM. That young Theologians may not be led into error, observe in the Edition of Bassanen in the year 1816, number 444, legi seqq.: whence nothing hinders that such a Sacrament may be called invalid. They will correct the error by reading it as valid. Let them also compare the words of the Salmanticensians cited in this volume, n. 521, with the Bassanensis edition, etc., and they will see how rightly they are quoted.

In hoc Tomo iterum plurimi Textus male citati vel allegati, cum ex Conciliis Arausicano, Carthaginensi et Patribus, Doctori Angelico Ill. D. Abelly, R. P. Antonio, Missale et Rituali Romano. In Decretis Pii PP. et Sanctae Romanae Curiae, tum ex Scriptura S. fuerunt correcti numeri 189. 190. 192. 196. 199. 202. 206. 208. 209. 210. 223. 249. 251. 254. 256. 262. 266. 269. 273. 274. 279. 281. 283. 287. 289. 295. 296. 297. 301. 305. 306. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 316. 318. 322. 331. 342. 343. 345. 357. 372. 385. 399. 400. 419. 421. 430. 437. 438. 440. 441. 442. 449. 451. 453. 457. 459. 461. 468. 469. 470. 474. 481. 508. 510. 511. 514. 519. 522. Textus ex Epist. 89. (melius 91.) S. Leonis num. 481 citatus, sic legatur: Si aliqui vi aegritudinis fidelium circumstantiam etc., ut simul et pænientiae etc. Incurrit penale quinque centum partes a die si retenitur ultra horam specificali. Oportet repatriare celeriter.